THE SHAKESPEARE ASSOCIATION BULLETIN

SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM, *Editor*

Contributing Editors

MRS. ROBERT CARLTON MORRIS ROBERT M. SMITH WILLIAM T. HASTINGS

Advisory Board

JOSEPH Q. ADAMS HARDIN CRAIG WILLIAM ALLAN NEILSON

VOL. 15 OCTOBER, 1940 NO. 4

CONTENTS

		PAGE
Baudelaire and Shakspere	*Max I. Baym*	195
"A Daniel Come to Judgment"	*Cyrus H. Gordon*	206
Studies in the Greene-Shakspere Relationship	*Thomas H. McNeal*	210
A Classical vs. A Social Approach to Shakspere's Autolycus	*Merritt Y. Hughes*	219
The Authorship of "Timon of Athens"	*Ralph A. Haug*	227
Shakspere for Pleasure	*I. C. Keller*	249
Communication: The Ancestry of Autolycus	*William T. Hastings*	253
Editorial Comment	*S. A. T.*	254

Published quarterly, in January, April, July, and October, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc., 601 West 113th Street, New York.

Subscription rate, $2.00 per year, postpaid. Single copies, fifty cents.

Membership in the Association includes annual subscription.

All correspondence relating to the conduct of the BULLETIN should be addressed to Dr. Samuel A. Tannenbaum, 601 West 113th Street, New York, N. Y.

Other matters relating to the work of the Association should be referred to the Secretary.

Copyright, 1937, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc.

BAUDELAIRE AND SHAKSPERE

[*Concluded*]

By MAX I. BAYM

BAUDELAIRE, whose injunction to himself was *Sois toujours poète, même en prose,*[99] was of necessity fascinated by music. His theory of *correspondences,* taken partly from Poe, who believed (as did Walter Pater after him) that all the arts aspired to the condition of music, drew music into the chain of interlocking stimuli and reactions. "Les parfums, les couleurs et les sons se répondent."[100] In his aspiration towards the infinite—such aspiration constituting one of the important phases of the Romantic Movement in all of its stages—Baudelaire found in music intimations of the infinite extension of space: 'la sensation de l'espace étendu jusqu'aux dernières limites concevables'.[101]

It is in this infinite sea of space[102] that the aspiring soul expresses its mystic ardours and its reach for an incommunicable God.[103] Wagner exemplified all this for Baudelaire and acted 'irrésistiblement sur l'esprit' and made him think of 'la manière large et aisée de Shakspeare'.[104] Music becomes a condition for spiritual and moral values. In it 'La pauvre humanité est rendue à sa patrie.'[105] It is certainly significant that in talking of music, notably in his essay on *Richard Wagner et Tannhäuser,* he had Shakspere clearly in his foreconsciousness, as may be seen from the number of times he refers to him there, and the reproach he makes to Ponsard for not knowing how to spell correctly the Christian name of the Bard.[106]

It is not too much to assume, then, that the author of *La Musique,* who said:

> La musique souvent me prend comme une mer!
> Vers ma pâle étoile[107]

remembered very well the passage on music put into the mouth of Lorenzo in *The Merchant of Venice;*—and his reading in Poe[108] certainly helped to call his attention to it:

> The man that hath no music in himself,

> Nor is not mov'd with concord of sweet sounds,
> Is fit for treasons, stratagems, and spoils.
> The motions of his spirit are dull as night
> And his affections dark as Erebus.
> Let no such man be trusted. Mark the music.[109]

Space will not permit the elaboration of details, but it is quite clear that the common denominators found by Professor Nicolson in Swinburne's *Poems and Ballads* and in *Les Fleurs du Mal*—

> 1) embittered reticence
> 2) an acid savour of frustration
> 3) 'the expense of spirit in a waste of shame'
> 4) the bruised poisons of pains[110]

may also be traced in parallel fashion, in Shakspere's *Sonnets*. The Marlovian and Shaksperian stamp in Baudelaire's treatment of death is quite patent. For both the Bard and Baudelaire Death is a dark velvet backdrop which intensifies the values of Love, Art, and Time—the three great themes (matières) of the *Sonnets* and *Les Fleurs du Mal*. Life, it appears, exacts a ransom from each of us. According to Baudelaire there are two ways of paying it: "L'un est *l'art* et l'autre *l'Amour*."[111] And as for Time, "Pour ne pas sentir l'horrible fardeau du *Temps* qui brise vos épaules et vous penche vers la terre, il faut vous enivrer sans trêve."[112]

In both works there is the awareness that "Le gouffre infranchissable, qui fait l'incommunicabilité, reste infranchi."[113] While in the *Sonnets* Elizabethan sunlight breaks in to relieve that awareness, in the *Flowers of Evil* Schopenhauerian or Pascalian gloom augments it.—Whereas we know little of Shakspere's life, we do know a great deal about Baudelaire's: the tragic sense of his own isolation, his "one long labour, in which time, money and circumstances were all against him".[114] No doubt, all this contributed to the gloom that plays in the Baudelairian garden. It is erroneous, however, to think of the French poet as a 'gardener of evil'.[115] If he was a stern analyst of evil, he did not mean to garner it. His cynicism was directed against it as well as against himself. We find this self-directed cynicism in L'*Héautontimorouménos*[116] (The Self-Tormentor), a poem, which, for Symons[117], as well as

for me, is highly reminiscent of Timon of Athens. But, withal,

> "There is some soul of goodness in things evil,
> Would men *observingly* distil it out".[118]

As an analyst of evil, Baudelaire would say with Jaques:

> . . . "Give me leave
> To speak my mind, and I will through and through
> Cleanse the foul body of the infected world" . . .[119]

In 1857 Sainte-Beuve, who had a tremendous influence on Baudelaire, wrote to the latter and told him that he liked more than one poem in *Les Fleurs du Mal;* that he liked especially *Tristesses de la Lune,* "délicieux sonnet qui semble de quelque poète anglais contemporain de la jeunesse de Shakspere."[120] After 1857,[121] the year in which the first edition of the *Flowers of Evil* had been published, Baudelaire went on working: adding some poems, working at various plans and articles, giving lectures and fighting off more and more feebly the 'fell sergeant, Death!'

In 1863 he sent a letter to Swinburne[122] who, in 1862, had reviewed glowingly the *Fleurs du Mal* in the *Spectator.*[123] "I should never have believed," said Baudelaire, "that an English littérateur could penetrate so well French beauty, French intentions (or meanings) and French prosody." It is significant, we think, that Swinburne, whose Hugolâttrie was notorious, and who never talked of Hugo without mentioning the name of Shakspere (and *vice versa*), brings in the name of Baudelaire in his *Study of Shakespeare.* There, discussing the difference between unimaginative Realism and imaginative Reality, he quotes Baudelaire à propos of this: "I have been many a time astonished, that to pass for an observer should be Balzac's great title to fame. To me it had always seemed that it was his chief merit to be a visionary and a passionate visionary. . . . All his fictions are as deeply colored as dreams. From the highest of the aristocracy to the lowest of the mob all the actors in his *Human Comedy* are keener, are living, more active and cunning in their struggles, more staunch in endurance of misfortune, more ravenous in enjoyment, more angelic in devotion, than the comedy of the real world shows them to us." This criticism would be equally true of Shakspere's characters,

and that is the point of quoting Baudelaire here. By the time Swinburne sat down to write *Atalanta* he had fallen under the Baudelairian spell, 'the dream carved in stone."[124]

The year 1864 arrived and with it the celebration all over Europe of the 300th anniversary of Shakspere's birth. Baudelaire's reaction to this event in France may be seen from what follows, and finds its analogue in the reaction of some people in England at the same time.

IV.

Opposed to the union of art and politics; to using the 300th anniversary of the birth of Shakspere as an occasion for the launching of Hugo's book on the Bard, timed exactly to appear on the anniversary date; and angered, no doubt, by the fact that he was not invited to be a member of the committee that was to arrange the celebration of Shakspere's birth, Baudelaire addressed a letter, which he signed with three stars, to *Figaro* of April 14, 1864—the very paper in which had previously appeared several attacks on himself. The shots of attack in *this* letter may be enumerated as follows:

Firstly, he didn't see why Finland, where the Poet was *not* born, had to celebrate His birthday. Why didn't France, for example, celebrate the anniversary of the birth of Chateaubriand or of Balzac? "People might tell me that their glory is still too young. But how about Rabelais?" Secondly, even supposing that all the literary men of Europe were moved to this spontaneous celebration out of a sense of grateful recognition, were the Parisian littérateurs really motivated by such a disinterested feeling, or were they rather the dupes of a small, self-seeking côterie? Thirdly, who were the members of the committee? M. Guizot, who made a poor translation of Shakspere, and that soulless mandrake, M. Villemain, who would cut a funny figure indeed in front of the statue of the most impassioned poet in the world; while men like Philarète Chasles and Émile Deschamps had been excluded; Gautier came *near* being excluded, and Eugène Delacroix (fortunately dead), the translator of *Hamlet* in his own medium, *would* have been excluded. Yes, and M. Charles Baudelaire, whose taste in Saxon literature is well known, had been forgotten. In the

fourth place—and here we must quote Baudelaire literally—: "You know, sir, that in 1848 there was concluded an *adulterous* alliance between the literary school of 1830 and Democracy, an alliance at once monstrous and bizarre. Olympio (*i.e.,* Hugo) abjured the famous doctrine of *Art for Art's Sake,* and since then he, his family, and his disciples have not ceased preaching to the people and showing themselves on all occasions as the assiduous friends and patrons of the masses. *Tendre et profond amour du peuple!* Since *then,* all that they can love in literature has taken on revolutionary and philanthropic color. Shakespeare is a socialist! He never suspected it,—but never mind. . . . We are familiar with this sort of calculated delusion." Finally, to sum up, this banquet (for which the birth of Shakspere is a mere pretext) will serve the following ends:

a) to make way for, and to promote the success of, V. Hugo's book on Shakspere (a book full of beauty and foolishness);

b) to proffer a toast to Denmark. One owes it to Hamlet, the best known prince of Denmark.

c) to top the unique crescendo of events marking the idiocy of the masses who are busy offering up toasts to Jean Valjean, to universal brotherhood, etc., etc., 'and to all the stupidities characteristic of this 19th century, in which we have the depressing happiness of living and in which each one of us is deprived of the natural right of choosing his neighbor.'

Such was the content of the letter Baudelaire addressed to *Figaro.*[125] Naturally, there were repercussions. According to a letter he wrote from Belgium to his mother, the libel was suddenly spread by swine of "la bande d'Hugo" that he (Baudelaire) belonged to the French police. "C'est une vengeance à propos d'une lettre que j'ai publiée à Paris, et où je me moquais du fameux banquet shakespearien."

As a matter of fact, Victor Hugo's book on Shakspere is a fascinating work,[126] for all of its dithyramb, and quite apart from what it says or does not say about Shakspere. But Baudelaire, in 1864, already abnormal and involved in all sorts of personal and material difficulties in Brussels, came to hate Hugo and was hardly in a position any longer to judge the latter's work fairly. He still admits his genius,

but adds ironically: "Je n'accepterais ni son génie, ni sa fortune, s'il me fallait au même temps posséder ses énormes ridicules."[127]

Baudelaire had been saving up ill-will against himself since 1857, the year when *Les Fleurs du Mal* made its dramatic and inauspicious appearance.[128] It did not help him much to declare that "Hugo's reputation is so well estabtablished that he doesn't need this or that particular person's admiration."[129] On December 4, 1856, Ponsard delivered his discourse of reception into the Academy. According to Baudelaire, who referred to this *discourse* in 1861,[130] the *deplorable academician* introduced into his speech an appreciation of the genius of Shakspere, "qu'il appelait familièrement le vieux *Williams,* ou *le bon Williams.*" Such an appreciation was worthy, he said, of a concierge of the Comédie-Française: "J'ai senti en frissonant le dommage que ce pédant sans orthographe allait faire à mon pays." Then he goes on to tell how for several days the English newspapers made fun of the French. "Les littérateurs français, à les entendre, ne savaient pas même l'orthographe du nom de Shakspeare; ils ne comprenaient rien à son génie, et la France abêtie ne connaissait que deux auteurs, Ponsard et Alexandre Dumas fils,[131] les poètes favoris du nouvel Empire." He adds correctly: "Notez que la haine politique combinait son élément avec le patriotisme littéraire outragé." While in the 1865 edition of Ponsard's speech there are references to 'le divin William' and 'ce bonhomme Shakespeare', needless to say there is no trace of the scandalous 'vieux Williams' or 'le bon Williams."[132]

The 1864 letter, therefore, came as one of a series the public had become accustomed to. Incidentally, it is amusing to notice, with respect to the 1864 celebration of the Tercentenary of Shakspere's birth, that the situation in England paralleled that in France. There, too, there were differences, disputes, quarrels and recriminations. All of this is revealed in a pamphlet found in the Rare Book Room of the Boston Public Library. It is by D. Gordon[133] and is entitled *Ethics of the Shakespeare Celebration,* published in London, 1864. The author attended a meeting of Birmingham operatives where plans were made for the Shakspere centenary. He

pokes fun at the oratory and the Shakspere mania. Why demonstrate at all? This is nothing but a National Puppet Show. In these times "a day's notoriety can be had for next to nothing." Tompkins and Higginbottom will "favor us with a sumptuous poem," but not Tennyson or Kingsley, Mr. Ruskin, Dean Stanley, Dickens, or E. B. Lytton. "April 23 will be the Day of the triumph of the great Nobodies." J. C. Bellew, a religious luminary of the first magnitude, will preside and "a great deal of insufferable poetry will be produced." Gordon ends with the statement that it is scandalous to worship genius when Jesus is recognized. Carlyle is to blame for all this fostering of worship of genius, so is Benjamin Disraeli (who is also attacked).[134]—In general, it might be added, that English publications of the day satirized members of the National Shakspere Committee for "endeavoring to reap honor for themselves by writing their own little names by the side of the great Shakespeare."[135] This parallels Baudelaire's outcry against the mandrake Villemain 'in front of the statue of the most impassioned poet in the world."[136]

But to return to Baudelaire. It is clear that for him Shakspere had become the symbol of Poetry itself constantly being attacked and pulled down to the materialistic level of the bourgeoisie and their self-seeking prophets, who learned to use the demagogic slogans of the hour. Hugo himself became, for the Baudelaire of 1864, the arch demagogue invoking the name of the Arch-Poet!

V.

Given the genius of a Baudelaire, everything that passed through the alembic of his imagination conspired to produce *Les Fleurs du Mal:* early childhood impressions, the Bible, Latin decadent literature, Pascal, a taste for metaphysics, early manhood experiences with women and men, admiration of the whole body of European romantic literature, including Goethe, Chateaubriand, Sainte-Beuve, Victor Hugo, De Vigny, Eugène Delacroix in the arts, Mrs. Radcliffe, Walpole, Maturin, Poe, Hoffman, Shelley, Keats, De Quincey, (even Longfellow). Take all these facets and you have the Shaksperian mirror in which the imagination frames the figure of Hamlet as a reflection of

the beholder. It is this figure that goes 'wandering in the fields where curiosity is forbidden to go, approaching the dark gulf near enough to look in.'[137] From these fields, or in them, sprang the *Flowers of Evil.*

In Baudelaire we have the whole complexity of the modern soul,[138] which in one of its aspects is characterized by the so-called aesthetic shiver—that 'frisson nouveau' which Hugo said Baudelaire had discovered. His imagery is at many points that of Keats[139] touched with a Dantian sombreness out of which Milton's Satan frequently peers. In him, too, we have the 'ironie amère' of such poets as Heine and Byron. But what Keats, Milton, Heine[140] and Byron owed to Shakspere represents the sum-total (not quite) of what Baudelaire owed to the author of *Hamlet.* We can now understand the full meaning of Paul Fort and Louis Mandin's reference to Baudelaire as "ce génie composite, cet Hamlet plus compliqué que celui de Shakespeare. . ."[141] He is more complicated to the extent that modern life is more complex than was that of the Elizabethan period.[142]

Hugo and Lamartine may have tried to write, at times, like Shakspere; Baudelaire *is* Shaksperian. The 'tintamare' of Victor Hugo (to borrow a word from Proust) is rhetoric in hose and doublet; the *mal* of Baudelaire is Hamlet, no longer an actor, but an act of the torn spirit of modern man.

Drama, as theatrical form, Baudelaire did not hold in the highest esteem. He considered it as the least inspiring of all forms of art. He seems to have neither praise nor blame for Shakspere as a dramatist. To be sure, some of his own poems are dramas in miniature; but they deal (as Rhodes says) with the drama carried on in the depths of his own heart.[143] The adult's demand for the clap-trap of the theatre is put to shame by the imaginative power of children who turn a chair so readily into a train. "The plays of Shakspere could remain beautiful," Baudelaire claims, "even if staged with properties of a barbaric simplicity."[144]

We might say, then, that Baudelaire appreciated and admired Shakspere as a poet who employed dramatic in-

tensities in his poetry. On the other hand, D'Aurevilly thought that Baudelaire, though very lyrical in expression, was at bottom a dramatic poet and that his *Fleurs du Mal* was a nameless drama in which he (Baudelaire) was the universal actor. He was like Shakspere, D'Aurevilly says, in that he did not flinch in the presence of details, no matter how revolting; but unlike him, in that he could not remain impersonal; he couldn't escape 1800 years of Christianity. The Christian in him is paramount—

> *Ah! Seigneur! donnez-moi la force et le courage*
> *De contempler mon coeur et mon corps sans dégoût!*[145]

"It is characteristic of Shakspeare," says Lilly B. Campbell,[146] "that he treats the passion of grief in all its possibilities, that he embodies in different characters the different phases of the passion that he wishes to present, and that he discusses the physiological and psychological aspects of the passion, together with the particular moral problems which interested his period, and which were most closely related to the passion anatomized in this particular work." Keeping in mind that grief equals *douleur,* and that the problem of *evil* was as important in Baudelaire's day as in Shakspere's, what Miss Campbell has to say of Shakspere is equally true of Baudelaire.

"Don Juan, Dante, Hamlet, quels échos l'orgueil, l'inquiétude, l'angoisse de ces tourmentés soulèveront dans *les Fleurs du mal!*" exclaims a French student[147] of Baudelaire.

After Shakspere's blood had been transfused in the veins of poets that followed him, Baudelaire's book of poems was to become for a full century[148] the breviary of 'the progress of the passions.'[149]

During the last three years of his life he could well ask Hamlet's question and answer it in the Dane's fashion:

> What is he whose grief
> Bears such an emphasis, whose phrase of sorrow
> Conjures the wand'ring stars and makes them stand
> Like wonder-wounded hearers? This is I,
> Hamlet, the Dane![150]

The Dane?—No; a French poet who was preoccupied with 'the perpetual and simultaneous relation of the ideal and life'—'du rapport perpétuel, simultané de l'idéal avec la

vie'; a modern poet who distilled beauty from pain, sorrow, and guilt, and who in that distillation was a noble descendant of that other poet whom the world calls her own with each returning Spring,—William Shakspere!

Brooklyn, N. Y.

---

[99]Baudelaire, *Oeuvres,* II, 669 (Mon Coeur Mis A Nu).
[100]*Ibid,* 487 (Richard Wagner et Tannhäuser).
[101]*Ibid,* 488.
[102]The association of *infinity* (infinite time, infinite space) with music has a long history. In the latter part of the 19th century this association is to be found in the Symbolists. Also, to a remarkable extent, the developmental novel, in the latter part of the 19th and in the 20th century is built on the twin themes of Time and Music, the latter being an expression of the former.
[103]Baudelaire, *Oeuvres,* II, (Richard Wagner et Tannhäuser) 497.
[104]*Ibid,* 498.
[105]*Ibid.*
[106]*Ibid,* 516. The essay on Wagner was written in 1860.
[107]In *Spleen et Idéal* series.
[108]*Vide supra,* n. 77.
[109]*Merchant of Venice,* V, i, 83f.
[110]Nicolson, Harold, *Swinburne and Baudelaire* (The Zaharoff Lecture, Oxf., 1930), p. 12.
[111]*La Rançon,* in *Nouvelles Fleurs du Mal.*
[112]*Poèmes en Prose* (Baudelaire, *Oeuvres,* 1, 468.)
[113]Baudelaire, *Oeuvres,* II, 658.
[114]Symons, 88.
[115]Many still regard him as such.
[116]In *Spleen et Idéal* series.
[117]Symons, 47.
[118]*Henry V,* iv, i, 4-5. (Italics mine).
[119]*As You Like It,* II, vii, 58-60.
[120]*Les Fleurs du Mal,* précédées d'une Notice par T. Gautier, Paris, 1868, pp. 397-8.
[121]That year (Friday, Sept. 11, 1857) he went, together with Madame Sabatier, to see his friend Rouvière play in *King Lear.* (Vide *Lettres, 1841-66,* 143).
[122]This letter was lost in transit and was not discovered till 1912. He had also sent Swinburne a copy of *Wagner et Tannhäuser à Paris* (1861).
[123]In 1862 Swinburne also reviewed Meredith's *Modern Love,* that came out that year. "An astonishing feat in the vivisection of the heart in verse," Symons called it. (See Symons, 87). In the same year Swinburne became acquainted with the *Rubayat* and with *Leaves of Grass.*
[124]Lafourcade, Georges—*Swinburne, A Literary Biography.* London, 1932, p. 112.
[125]Baudelaire, *Oeuvres,* II, 762-66.
[126]See Hooker, Kenneth Ward, *The Fortunes of Victor Hugo in England.* N. Y., 1938. Hugo's book was originally intended as a prefatory essay to his son's translation of Shakspere. It appeared simultaneously in an English version. Some critics and reviews saluted it: Frank Marzials in the newly-established *Reader;* the *Athenaeum* and *Blackwood's.* Fraser's, on the other hand, said: "The author of *Les Misérables* ought not to have published such ill-digested works as the *Vie de Shakespeare.*" (Hooker, 159).
[127]Quoted in Symons, 85.
[128]Court proceedings against *Les Fleurs du Mal* had ben brought about by a notorious article written by Gustave Bourdin; it appeared in *Figaro,* July 5, 1857. (Vide Baudelaire, *Oeuvres,* II, 762, n).
[129]In a letter addressed to *Figaro,* June 13, 1858. (Vide *Oeuvres,* II, 450).
[130]*Ibid,* 516.
[131]In 1865 Baudelaire wrote in one of his letters: "Je suis bien aise que le fils de

Dumas se marie. J'espère que les douleurs du mariage le puniront de sa détestable littérature." (*Lettres, 1841-66,* p. 397).

[132] a). The *Discours de Réception* was made by Ponsard in 1856 (not in 1858, as Ferran seems to indicate on p. 664, note 173). No reference there to 'le bon Williams'. This mangling of the Bard's Christian name may have occurred in the original speech and in that way created journalistic notoriety and also reached Baudelaire, who was scandalized.

b.) Ponsard praises Shakspere and then contrasts with him Racine (arriving after Shakspere), avec son langage toujours pur, harmonieux . . ., avec sa logique, etc. Quelle surprise; quelle nouveauté! quel enthousiasme pour le révolutionnaire Racine! Quelle pitié, pour cet arriéré, ce vieux, ce bonhomme Shakspeare!' F. Ponsard, Oeuvres Compl. Disc. de Ré à L'Acc. Fr. 1856, pp. 27, 28).

[133]Boston Public Library Rare Book Room (G 3942.25 No. 4, 41 pp.). Sub-titled, *A Letter Addressed to a Lady in Sheffield.* Written in N. Sunderland, March 31, 1864, about the April 23rd Celebration of that year. I am grateful to Mr. Roger Thomas of Cambridge, who copied the material for me.

[134]Further insight into the English Celebration paralleling the French, may be gained by consulting the *Reader* for Dec. 19, 1863. and the *Athenaeum* for Jan. 2, 1864. In the latter we find a dispute between Henry Vizetelly and W. H. Dunn, editor of the *Athenaeum.* J. C. Jeaffreson, hon. sec. of the National Shakespeare Committe was involved. Thackeray was refused a vice-presidency in this group, though Dickens and Tennyson were vice-presidents.

[135]"Pamphlets on the Shakespeare Tercentenary." Boston Public Library Rare Book Room.

[136]Vide *ante,* 131, 138.

[137]Symons, 37. (Symons quotes these words from Lamb).

[138]Paul Fort et Louis Mandin. *Histoire de la Poésie Française* depuis 1850. Paris, 1926, p. 21.

[139]Symons, 19.

[140]Baudelaire, in writing to Janin, takes up the cudgels for Heine against Janin and associates the German poet's name with that of Byron and Shakspere (*Oeuvres,* II, 605).

[141]Paul Fort et Mandin, p. 27.

[142]Baudelaire himself defined 'l'homme sensible moderne' as a person who "is distinguished by a nervous and passionate temperament, a cultured mind, trained in the secrets of the plastic arts, a sensitive heart, attuned to sorrow, but easily excited and enthused. A taste for metaphysics and for the complex problems of philosophy and the human destiny are not foreign to his nature, nor a love for virtue . . .; and above all, an inner urge for personal dignity and human pride, things rare today, with which to combat and destroy the empire of the commonplace." (Quoted in Rhodes, II, 365).

[143]Rhodes, II, 297.

[144]Baudelaire, *Oeuvres,* II, 138.

[145]Les Fleurs du Mal, précédées d'une Notice par T. Gautier. Paris, 1868. pp. 369, 371. (Contains an *Appendice* of D'Aurevilly).

[146]Campbell, Lilly B., *Shakespeare's Tragic Heroes,* 1930, p. 113

[147]Ferran, 276.

[148]The latter half of the 19th and the first half of the 20th.

[149]Dr. Johnson's phrase.

[150]*Hamlet,* V, i, 278-282.

"A DANIEL COME TO JUDGMENT"

By CYRUS H. GORDON

ARCHEOLOGICAL discovery in the Near East has been adding steadily to our knowledge of history and of the development of civilization. Since our Eastern heritage forever reverberates through Western life and art, the unfailing stream of important discoveries in the cradles of civilization is bound to throw light on (among other things) the sources of Western literature.

When the case seems to be going his way, Shylock exclaims:

> "A Daniel come to judgment, yea, a Daniel!
> O wise young judge! how I do honour thee!"
> (*Merchant of Venice,* IV, i)

It is known that the reference is not to the canonical *Book of Daniel* but to the apocryphal *History of Susanna,* in which a youth named Daniel saves the life of the condemned Susanna and at the same time has her false accusers sentenced to death. Daniel handled the case so brilliantly that "from that day forth was Daniel had in great reputation in the sight of the people" (*Susanna,* v. 64).

Shakspere was not well posted on Jewish life. If he had been, he would not have put a reference to *Susanna* in Shylock's mouth. The apocryphal books were banned by the early rabbis and effectively eliminated from Jewish life. It is thanks to the church that the Apocrypha were preserved in Greek, Latin and other translations. The Jewish originals in Hebrew and Aramaic have almost, if not entirely, disappeared, and certainly none of the Jewish originals could have been available to a Venetian Jew. Daniel of the *Book of Daniel* would be quite familiar to any Jew, but that Daniel was not a judge. A traditional Jew might compare a keen judge with Solomon but hardly with Daniel of *Susanna.*

It is interesting to note that the name "Daniel" is appropriate to a judge. The first part *"dan(i)"* is derived from the Semitic root meaning "to judge," while *"el"* is the familiar theophorous element.

We now know that the judge-hero Daniel is an ancient figure in the lore of Canaan. The Hebrews, Phoenicians and other kindred peoples of Canaan (i.e., Syria-Palestine) shared a common literary heritage. The Canaanite nations all employed the same structures of verse and strophe; their dialects were closely related, especially in the poetry; they fell heir to much the same stock of myth and legend. The latest major addition to our knowledge of the Canaanites comes from the French excavations at Ugarit (modern Ras Shamra) on the north Syrian coast. In the course of the last eleven years the spade of the archeologist has uncovered there a library of unique significance. The library contains clay tablets inscribed in a hitherto-unknown cuneiform alphabet. Most of the texts are myths and epics. They were written in their present form in the reign of Niqmed, king of Ugarit, who was a vassal of the Hittite monarch Supiluliuma in the early part of the fourteenth century B.C. The Ugaritic poems are couched in a Canaanite dialect and possess unmistakable literary value. According to any reasonable system of chronology they are pre-Mosaic and pre-Homeric. In the opinion of the writer, the discovery of Ugaritic marks the greatest stride in the history of literature since the decipherment of Mesopotamian cuneiform in the nineteenth century. The importance of Ugarit is reflected in the length of the fifty-five page bibliography published over a year ago by the excavator of the site: M. Claude Schaeffer, *Ugaritica,* Paris, 1939, pp. 153-207. The bibliography is brought up to date in the present writer's *Ugaritic Grammar,* which is about to appear in Rome.

Among the Ugaritic poems is one that Professor Charles Virolleaud has published under the title *La Légende phénicienne de Danel* (Paris, 1936). This epic constitutes the most primitive account of the judge-hero Daniel. His identity is certain, for of him we read:

> "He judges the case of the widow,
> adjudicates the cause of the fatherless."

Daniel's story bears repetition. In the extant portions of the legend we learn that Daniel

> "has no son as have his brothers,
> nor a scion as have his kinsmen."

He accordingly wants a son who will (amusingly enough from our point of view):

> "hold his hand when drunk,
> his arm when full of wine";

a son who will plaster his father's roof, wash his clothes and fulfill filial duties in the temple. The gods are won over by drinks no less than by prayer, and so Daniel's wife at last conceives and bears a son, Aqhat. Daniel's joy, however, was not to endure. The goddess Anat, acting in concert with the god Yatpan and with a flock of eagles, killed Aqhat so that

> "his soul went out like wind,
> his spirit like a puff;
> like smoke out of his body."

One of the eagles devoured the body of Aqhat. After giving expression to his grief, Daniel resolves to retrieve his son's remains for burial. At length he spies a flock of eagles.

> "He lifts his voice and shouts:
> 'May Baal break the wings of the eagles!
> May Baal break their pinions!
> May they fall at my feet!
> I shall split their insides and look.
> If there is fat,
> If there is bone,
> I shall weep and bury him.
> I shall place him in the niche of the mute of the earth.'
> As soon as the word goes forth from his mouth,
> from his lips the utterance,
> Baal breaks the wings of the eagles,
> Baal breaks their pinions.
> They fall at his feet.
> He splits their insides and looks.
> There is no fat,
> there is no bone.
> He lifts his voice and cries:
> 'May Baal mend the wings of the eagles!
> May (Baal) mend their pinions!
> O eagles, flee and fly!' "

Undaunted by initial failure, Daniel sights Hargab, the father of the eagles. He brings him down with the same imprecation and, upon splitting his viscera, he again finds he has opened the wrong bird. After getting Baal to restore

Hargab, Daniel dismisses the father of the eagles. Finally, Daniel sees Samal, the mother of the eagles. Baal casts her down at Daniel's feet. On examining her insides, Daniel discovers

> "there is fat,
> there is bone."

Daniel removes the remains of Aqhat and, after weeping, buries him in an urn and proclaims:

> "May Baal break the wings of the eagles,
> may Baal break their pinions,
> if they fly over the grave of my son!"

Daniel then goes into mourning for Aqhat

> "from days to months,
> from months to years,
> until the seventh year."

Only then does Daniel stop weeping and dismiss the wailing women from his palace.

We do not know the outcome of the story because the closing portions are lost. However, a happy ending, with Aqhat restored to life, is not out of the question. For in those distant days when death did not seem so irrevocable, the dead might be brought back to life.

The judge-hero Daniel is also mentioned in *Ezekiel* 14:14 among the upright heroes of old: Noah, Daniel and Job. Critical scholars did not confuse this Daniel with his namesake of the lions' den, even before the epoch-making finds at Ugarit.

Accordingly, Daniel the judge is first attested at Ugarit in the fourteenth century B.C. Next he is alluded to in the Old Testament *Book of Ezekiel.* Then he recurs in *Susanna,* whence he finds his way into *The Merchant of Venice* in his pristine rôle as judge-hero.

Smith College
Northampton, Mass.

STUDIES IN THE GREENE-SHAKSPERE RELATIONSHIP

By THOMAS H. MCNEAL

THE Greene-Shakspere relationship, for all the speculation, romantic and otherwise, that has found its way into print, is, after all, a fairly simple matter. A young dramatist is moved by a sincere and lasting admiration for an older craftsman, an admiration that becomes possibly the greatest single influence in his literary life.

Only once is this enthusiasm threatened: during those few years after Greene's invective against the actor-playwright "Shakescene" in the *Groatsworth of Wit.* Evidently the elder writer's pocket-book had been touched, for more than rage at being pleasantly plagiarized must have stirred Greene. Certainly he had no word against Lodge's *Rosalynde,* which took over most of the technical tricks of the master's novels and used them to very good advantage.

But Shakspere's quarrel with his predecessor evidently began after Greene had quit the Elizabethan theatre, and the stage of life as well; and with no adversary present to fan the fires of retaliation into flame, his anger is short-lived and dies a natural and easy death. If Greene had lived and continued to gain popularity, and if he had been able to shame or otherwise force his disciple away from developing Dorotheas and Margarets into Rosalinds and Violas, one wonders what direction Shakspere's comic and tragi-comic genius might have taken. There could hardly have been a *Winter's Tale,* at any rate. But any choler that perhaps found its way into certain of his works directly following the death of Greene soon subsided. Greene's banished heroines masquerading in men's clothes, his villain-heroes, his faithful clowns, his charming outdoor scenes—all this paraphernalia of romantic comedy Shakspere went on borrowing as though Greene had not died with "Stop thief!" on his lips. Towards the very end, *Pandosto* is given a magnificent paraphrase, and Miranda and her Prince, in the *Tempest,* reflect the dead man's touch.

Thus Greene came early into the young dramatist's life

and remained late. Only for a moment does Shakspere's approbation waver, and then returns more apparent than ever. Such thoughts are forced upon one after a careful examination of Greene's works, with Shakspere constantly in mind; and it is believed that they will appear even more evident in the light of the small findings in the Greene-Shakspere relationship that follow—should these be thought, in the mind of the reader, to hold water.

I

The Aftermath of '92, as Revealed in Sonnet CXXX and A Midsummer Night's Dream

Greene has left us only one long poem that is indisputably his own—*A Maidens Dreame. Upon the Death of the right Honorable Sir Christopher Hatton, Knight, late Lord Chancelor of England, 1591. "by Robert Green Master of Arts."*[1] Another poem of considerable length, however, *A Most Rare and Excellent Dreame, Learnedly Set Downe by a Woorthy Gentleman, A Brave Scholler, and M. of Artes in Both Universities,* which was printed in *The Phoenix Nest* in 1593, is properly attributed to Greene. In a note on the poem, in his recent edition of the famous miscellany, Professor Hyder E. Rollins states the general opinion of scholars regarding Greene's authorship of the piece:

> This poem is generally attributed to Greene because he was an M.A. of Cambridge (1583) and of Oxford (1588)—a fact to which the title pages of his books often bear witness. . . . It seems certain that the title of the poem was meant to suggest Greene, and probably, judging from the poem itself (which in many ways resembles *A Maidens Dreame* . . . 1591, . . . "by Robert Green Master of Arts"), that he actually was the author. Such have been the conclusions of almost every scholar who has touched on *The Phoenix Nest.*[2]

Probably the two poems were written at about the same time, since one appears the year before Greene's death and the other the year after. The last work may have been found among Greene's papers, and sold or given to the printers of *The Phoenix Nest.* "We know that certain papers of Greene's were in the hands of printers after his death in the previous year."[3] Professor Rollins's statement that *A Most*

Rare and Excellent Dreame" in many ways resembles *A Maidens Dreame"* probably takes into consideration the facts that the poems are both composed in rime royal, that they are built upon the framework of the old love-vision or dream-poem, that they are long, and that they were not written in connection with the romances—all of which peculiarities set them apart from the rest of Greene's verse.

A Most Rare and Excellent Dreame has no importance as a work of art; for it is, in fact, a perfunctory and uninteresting piece of work, clearly modeled in the school of the love-vision. Present is the sleepless, despairing lover, the coming of sleep, the meeting of lovers in a dream, a list of the lady's charms, a final awakening.

> The poem opens with an extended discussion of the cause of dreams, after the mediaeval manner. Then follows the visit of a lady to her sleeping lover. The lover (in the first person) describes her beauties and tells of his restless and hopeless state. The lady and he discuss the subject of love at some length. She is firm in her denials, and he faints away in a swoon. Thereupon she, fearing that he is dead, relents; and the lover comes back to life and the waking state.[4]

What William Shakspere thought of this last literary performance of the then dead man can at least be surmised. The poem is undeniably weak, and the "vstart Crow" must have been somewhat prejudiced by now against Greene's works in general; for *The Groatsworth of Wit,* with its tirade against him, had appeared scarcely a year before, and Greene's accusation had caused considerable talk.

Furthermore, he was in a fit mood to dislike the poem because of another reason. Like many another young poet at the beginning of a career, he was in revolt against the art standards of his times. He appears to have especially distrusted the sighing lover and denying lady *motif* present in much of the poetry of the day; and to have had a disgust for the artificial listing of a lady's charms, which grew almost inevitably out of the first situation. Such ideas were rife in the imitations of the mediaeval love-vision, well illustrated in *A Most Rare and Excellent Dreame;* and in the more popular Petrarchan sonnets that were in full flower in the early '90's.

The unreality of such time-bitten notions comes in for a lashing in Shakspere's *Sonnets XXI* and *CXXX,* pieces probably belonging, because of these ideas expressed in them, to the period of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *Romeo and Juliet*—two or three years after Greene's rebuke, and one or two after the appearance of *A Most Rare and Excellent Dreame.* Sir Sidney Lee comments upon the satire of the two sonnets as follows:

> Similarly in Sonnet CXXX, . . . the poet satirises the conventional lists of precious stones, metals, and flowers, to which the sonneteers likened their mistresses' features. It was not the only time that Shakespeare deprecated the sonneteer's practice of comparing features of women's beauty with the "earth and sea's rich gems." . . . Spenser in his Amoretti, No. ix., gives Shakespeare a very direct cue, as may be seen when Spenser's cited sonnet is read alongside Shakespeare's sonnet xxi.[5]

J. Q. Adams likewise finds satire and revolt against current literary fashions:

> The same note of ridicule appears in Sonnet 21. . . . And in Sonnet 130 he laughs at the style of the conventional sonneteer.[6]

It is likely, however, that Shakspere draws the bow in *Sonnet CXXX* for a target more particular than Elizabethan sonneteers in general—that the arrow is meant for *A Most Rare and Excellent Dreame.* The poem is long, and contains much material not found in *Sonnet CXXX.* But if that passage wherein the lover lists the charms of his lady is placed beside Shakspere's fourteen lines, some interesting parallels may be observed:

Greene:

Hir Amber tresses on hir shoulders lies,
The which as she doth moue, diuided run,
About hir bodie iust in circle wise,
Like to the curious web Arachne spun;
Or lese to make a fit comparison,
Like slender twist turned to shining fyre,
Or flames by woonder *wrought into a wire.*

The forehead that confines these burnisht haires,
For *whiteness* striueth with vntouched *snowe;*
For smoothnes with the Iuorie compares;
And doth the Alabasters glistring showe,
Vnder this firmament you are to know,
Two powrfull stars which at their pleasure moue,
The variable effects that follows loue.

Hir cheekes resembleth right a garden plot,
Of diuers sorts of rare Carnation flowres,
The which the scortching Sun offendeth not,
Nor boystrous winter with his rotting showres;
Vncertaine Iuno thereon neuer lowres:
Here Venus with hir little loues reposes,
Amongst the lillies and the *damaske roses.*
Hir lips compares with the Vermilion morne,
Hir equall teeth semicircle wise,
For orientnes selected pearle may scorne;
What may I of hir issuing breath deuise,
That from this pearle and Synaber doth rise:
The francumsense and myrr, that Inde presents,
Within this aire leese their extolled sents.
. . . . . .
Girt with a tawnie Cyprous were hir clothes,
And thus attirde, this Angell woman goes.[6]

Shakspere:
My Mistres eyes are nothing like the Sunne,
Currall is farre more red, than her lips red,
If snow be white, why then her brests are dun;
If haires be wiers, black wiers grow on her head:
I have seene *Roses damaskt,* red and white,
But no such *Roses see I in her cheekes,*
And in some perfumes is there more delight,
Then in the breath that from my Mistres reekes.
I love to heare her speake, yet well I know,
That Musicke hath a farre more pleasing sound:
I graunt I never saw a goddesse goe,
My Mistres when shee walkes treads on the ground.
And yet by heaven I thinke my love as rare,
As any she beli'd with false compare.[7]

The italicized lines show how particular is Shakspere's negation of the passage from *A Most Rare and Excellent Dreame.* Granted that the whiteness of snow, the sweetness of breath, and hairs of wire are conventional comparisons in Elizabethan poetry, it is rather against the laws of chance that all of these and more should be served up in a satirical sonnet in much the same order that Greene previously arranged them in his last printed poem. The cutting thrust by which Shakspere has apparently turned an "Angell woman" into a creature of flesh and blood who "treads on the ground" is final and best internal evidence.

A Midsummer Night's Dream carries on this war against charm lists and spineless lovers and cruel ladies, expanding

them into sound and fury. At the very outset the comedy takes on the vaguely familiar though disjointed form of the love-vision. The title itself suggests the dream-poem; but instead of a May-day or spring-time setting, the accent is placed upon night, and the season is mad midsummer. Gradually Bottom and the lovers drift into the wood so often found in the old formula, led by Puck rather than the usual animal guide. Gradually each is put to sleep—each goes into a dream of madness—where women woo and are disdained and list their lovers' charms; where the old etiquette of courtly love is speared and slain. "I am your spaniel," says the unorthodox Helena to Demetrius. "Away, you Ethiope!" cries Lysander to Hermia.

But reality returns with the day, and all are roused when "huntsmen wake them with their horns." It is difficult, however, to distinguish the real from the unreal in such matters.

> Are you sure
> That we are awake?

asks Demetrius;

> It seems to me
> That yet we sleep, we dream.

With that the farce of the love-vision is over,[8] and Shakspere turns in the last act to a final shot at another favorite theme of his, the weakness of the English stage.

The relation of the play to Robert Greene may be both general and particular. The man was especially vulnerable for satire in the field of the love-vision. Of the pieces that he composed towards the end of his troubled career, *Orpharion* (1588), *A Maidens Dreame* (1590), *A Quip for an Upstart Courtier* (1592), *Greene's Vision* (1592), and *A Most Rare and Excellent Dreame* (1593), all use in some form or other the dream plan.

It is the last of these works, however, that seems to bear the brunt of particular satire. Bully Bottom, awakening from the experiences of his love-vision, cries out:

> I have had a most rare vision. I have had a dream, past the wit of man to say what dream it was: man is but an ass, if he go about

> to expound this dream. Methought I was—; there is no man can tell what. Methought I was,—and methought I had,—but man is but a patched fool, if he will offer to say what methought I had. The eye of man hath not heard, the ear of man hath not seen, man's hand is not able to taste, his tongue to conceive, nor his heart to report what my dream was. I will get Peter Quince to write a ballad of this dream: it shall be called Bottom's Dream, because it hath no bottom. (IV, viii, 208-21).

Bottom's statement, "I have had a most rare vision. I have had a dream," may be taken as a rather obvious travesty of the title *A Most Rare and Excellent Dreame.* Again, the poem is as long and rambling in content as it is in its full title, and might well be called "Bottom's Dream, because it hath no bottom." Furthermore, an examination of what "Bottom's Dream" must have been if Peter Quince had ever set it down on paper reveals an excellent burlesque of Greene's poem. For it is Titania who woos, while the hero remains coy; and it is Titania who lists the Ass-lover's charms—his "amiable cheeks," his "sleek smooth head," and his "fair large ears." The date of the poem, too, is an aid to the argument, for it was probably less than a year old when *A Midsummer Night's Dream* first saw the stage.

A connection between Greene and Bottom has already been argued. J. M. Brown, in "An Early Rival of Shakespere," says:

> Shakespeare, with all his tolerance, was unable to refrain from retaliation; but it is with no venomous pen that he retaliates. . . . In the *Midsummer Night's Dream* . . . he takes this early school of amateur player-poets, and pillories them in Bottom, Quince, Snug, Flute, Snout, and Starveling; and with elfin machinery he borrows from Greene, and turns his caricature, Bottom, into everlasting ridicule.[9]

E. K. Chambers notes, relative to a line from Bottom's speech—"it shall be called Bottom's Dream, because it hath no bottom"—that "Mr. Fleay suggests that there is here a hit at Robert Greene, who called one of his poems *A Maiden's Dream,* for the apparent reason that there was no maiden in it."[10]

Brown's suggestion, though interesting, is too general; and Fleay's note misses the point. That there was no maiden in the poem of *A Maidens Dreame* means nothing. The piece is an elegy, addressed to the Lady Elizabeth Hatton on the death of her uncle, Sir Christopher Hatton,

Lord Chancellor of England; and Greene probably felt that his words of consolation to this woman should be placed in the mouth of a woman. The date of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* is a barrier, too. It has generally been placed between the years 1593-'96,[11] too long after the appearance of *A Maidens Dreame* (1590) for Bottom's satirical speech to have been understood by an audience. Also, there are missing in the poem situations that would lead to satire on courtly love. The poem is an elegy, not a love-vision; no lovers are present, only a dead knight. The listing of a woman's charms gives way to the recounting of a man's admirable and generous qualities. Finally, Shakspere would hardly have satirized an elegy written on the death of the "late Lord Chancellor of England."

It is worth while to note how completely these difficulties that we encounter if we accept *A Maidens Dreame* as the butt of Bottom's jest disappear when we substitute for that poem *A Most Rare and Excellent Dreame* (1593). That the literate part of Shakspere's audience recognized the allusion is very probable. Robert Greene had been too well known in London for anybody who kept up with literature of the day not to have caught any significance in the word "dream" when it appeared in one of Shakspere's titles—only a short time after the author had been described by a master given to "dreams" as "beautified with our feathers." Bottom's speech might thus have been anticipated. That the shot was fired at Greene's last and posthumous poem, appearing in the *Phoenix Nest* of recent date, likewise insured for the playwright an audience familiar with the work travestied.

[*To be continued*]

---

[1]*The Plays and Poems of Robert Greene.* The Clarendon Press, 1905, II, 219.
[2]*The Phoenix Nest.* Harvard University Press, 1931, p. 144, n. 39, 2.
[3]J. C. Jordan, *Robert Greene,* p. 142.
[4]*Ibid.,* p. 143.
[5]*A Life of Shakespeare.* The Macmillan Co., 1916, p. 190; continued in n. 3.
[6]*The Phoenix Nest,* p. 34, 11. 25ff.
[7]*Sonnet CXXX.* J. O. Beaty and J. W. Bower, *Famous Editions of English Poets.* Richard R. Smith, Inc., New York, 1931, p. 50.
[8]So full is Shakspere of his subject that it is almost inevitable that these ideas which are developed into the full-fledged play of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and touched upon in two of the sonnets should have spilled over into *Romeo and Juliet,*

a tragedy following close upon the heels of the comedy. At once we meet the artificial and sighing Romeo and the denying Rosaline. The reality of Juliet's love, however, intrudes and awakens the hero out of his ridiculous dream. An echo of the fun in the comedy appears when Mercutio calls out in ridicule of Romeo, "Cry but 'Aye me!' "—when in the very next scene Juliet breaks the silence of the night with that same conventional lover's sigh. There is rich comedy in the first balcony scene; and most of it grows out of Juliet's inability to hold to Petrarchan standards of love making. Her long apology to Romeo for not being able to pretend is excellent satire. But "farewell compliment!" she cries. Then, frightened at her own audacity, she adds,

> Or, if thou think'st I am too quickly won,
> I'll frown and be perverse and say thee nay.

[9]*New Zealand Magazine,* No. 6, pp. 97-133, 1877. Brown's article is substantially reproduced in Vol. I of Grosart's edition of Greene's works, from which this passage is taken, p. xviii.

[10]Arden Shakespeare, p. 125, note on IV, ii. 220-1.

[11]R. A. Law, "On the Dating of Shakespeare's Plays." *S.A.B.* (1936), IX: 50.

A CLASSICAL *vs.* A SOCIAL APPROACH TO SHAKSPERE'S AUTOLYCUS

By MERRITT Y. HUGHES

"AUTOLYCUS," says Miss Christine White, improving on the critics who have seen the rogue as "all English," "reflects not only the outward, vivid details of Elizabethan low life but also . . . the social causes and the conditions that governed such a life and made it all too common in Elizabethan England."[1] In her study the playboy to whom " 'twas nothing to geld a codpiece of a purse" becomes "Shakspere's final glance at the servant problem in Elizabethan England."[2] We are asked to regard Autolycus as a social document of larger implication than a mere portrait of the ordinary prigman "whose property," as John Awdeley said in *The Fraternity of Vagabonds,* it was to "steal clothes off the hedge."[3] Because on his own word the knave "served Prince Florizel and in (his) time wore three-pile,"[4] we are expected to accept his story as Shakspere's analysis of social forces that were bringing the pages of the great down to the revenue of "the silly cheat."[5] Miss White makes his background as vivid as Mr. Whibley does the whole background of low life in his chapter on "Rogues and Vagabonds" in *Shakespeare's England.*[6] She has ransacked the records of the Elizabethan underworld and scanned its economic history for evidence that Autolycus in *The Winter's Tale* is a social document, and that his progress from courtier to rogue—against which "title and what else belongs to't"[7] he boasts that he is "proof"—interested Shakspere somewhat as the plight of the Joads interested Steinbeck. Her object is to make Autolycus socially significant for us and, less explicitly, for his creator.

Though, as she planned her article, Miss White may not have meant to attribute deliberate "social criticism" to Shakspere, that is what she does when she writes that he used Autolycus "to glimpse varying social planes and problems that in earlier plays he had portrayed in detail."[8] Her theory, if far pursued, would end in interpretations of that scapegrace and of those other younger sons of hypothetical decayed families—Orlando, Malvolio, and "Lear's discharged retainers"[9]—which would parallel A. A. Smirnov's

Marxist interpretation of Caliban as "a true revolutionary."[10] Basically, however, her interest is historical rather than ideological; and, like all historical interpretations, hers must be judged on aesthetic grounds.

In comparison with the sentimentalized Autolycus of the nineteenth century, who has not yet quite disappeared, Miss White gives us a much more convincing and satisfying figure. Beside it, Georg Brandes' conception of the rogue as on his way up rather than down in the world becomes ludicrous; and still more absurd becomes his declaration that Autolycus embodies Shakspere's fondness for "the natural wit, good sense, and kind-heartedness of the lower classes"[11] whenever he had to portray a "clown." To have rediscovered that Autolycus has come down, not up, in life, and that he is not an amiable rustic, nor even the merely diverting rogue without a touch of malice in him which Robert Bridges saw and Professor Peter Alexander still sees,[12] is a long step toward the aesthetic truth about him. Yet those essential facts about him should have been as clear to Brandes and to Bridges as they were to Coleridge when he described Autolycus as "one who had lived and been reared in the best society, and had been precipitated from it by 'die and drab'."[13] There is enough common ground between Miss White and Coleridge for us to compare his moralist's theory of the character with her view of it as a social historian. Because neither of them gives us a fundamentally comic conception, we shall do well to be sceptical of both, and to look further afield and deeper down in Shakspere's imagination for some of the elements that went to the making of his most convincing rascal.

In different ways both Miss White and Coleridge betray uneasiness about the judgment that awaits their views at the bar of purely aesthetic judgment, when all the evidence on other levels is available and has been given its proper weight. Miss White treats Shakspere's addition of his realistic rogue to "a romantic play of strange people in foreign lands, caught in an extraordinary tangle of circumstances" as a final touch of artistry, for "the strange and the extraordinary lose their effect unless there is the realistic and commonplace to supply adequate contrast."[14] Coleridge, thinking chiefly of Autolycus' impact upon the lovely third

scene of the fourth act of *The Winter's Tale,* found that it struck against his "feelings as a note out of tune, and as not coalescing with the *pastoral* tint which gives such charm to the . . . act."[15] Of the conclusion to Autolycus' first soliloquy—"for the life to come, I sleep out the thought of it"[16] —he said that "it is too Macbeth-like in the snapper-up of unconsidered trifles." For Coleridge, though Autolycus was no less vivid and actual a character than he is for us, he was less topical than tragic.

To modern readers a topical approach may seem less alien than a tragic one to the right comic interpretation of the character. Coleridge's comparison of Autolycus with Macbeth is absurd, yet it may remind us that in his drawing there is as much moral ambiguity as there is of physical metamorphosis in his four appearances in the play. He is a figure such as Pirandello would have liked to embroider. In his speeches we often have the tragi-comedy of character outstripped by intelligence. So we find it in the tirade after the shepherds have bought all his wares and had their purses picked into the bargain: "Ha, ha! what a fool Honesty is ! and Trust, his sworn brother, a very simple gentleman!"[17] The reasoning is reminiscent of Falstaff on honor, but instead of going on in that vein, Autolycus drops into a catalogue of the trumpery that he has sold. Again, after his attempt to gull the old shepherd and his son, when they are on their way with Perdita's tokens to Polixenes, his boasting in the soliloquy which ends the act rises to Pirandellian levels of irony: "If I had a mind to be honest, I see fortune would not suffer me; she drops booties in my mouth."[18] The eternal confidence man gloats over his eternally imbecile victim. In just the form that he put it, Coleridge's criticism may be inept, but it establishes a kind of universality in Autolycus that is more than topical.

And, in fact, he is not a merely topical or a merely Elizabethan figure. Like the first bearer of his name, he was begotten on Parnassus, and his first speech tells us that he is aware of that fact. His first words are a confession that, in a slightly different sense from the first Autolycus in Homer, he was littered under Mercury."[19] When he wrote that speech, Shakspere was of course playing with the astrological notion that character corresponds with horoscope;

but he was not giving his rogue any delusions in the matter or furnishing him with the pseudo-scientific excuse of "an enforced obedience to planetary influence"[20] for being a gambler, thief and fornicator. Such a notion would have seemed no less "excellent foppery"[21] to Autolycus than it did to Edmund in *Lear*. Shakspere must have known, at least at second hand, Ovid's tale of Mercury's bold rape of the nymph, Chione, on the slopes of Mount Parnassus, and he would certainly have been familiar with the myth that blamed, not the stars, but Autolycus' own father, the god, for his character. As George Sandys translated the story:

> Nor from the Sire the Sonne degenerates,
> Cunning in theft, and wily in all sleights:
> Who could with subtiltie deceaue the sight;
> Converting white to black, and black to white.[22]

Ovid's ultimate source for his yarn is usually traced in the nineteenth book of the *Odyssey,* where, in a long digression, Ulysses remembers a childhood visit to Autolycus' hunting lodge in a glen on Mount Parnassus, and recalls that the old man, his grandfather, had been (in Chapman's words) with

> "th'art
> Of theft and swearing (not out of the heart,
> But by equivocation) first adorn'd,
> Your witty man withal, and was suborn'd
> By Jove's descent, ingenious Mercury,
> Who did bestow it."[23]

Neither Homer nor Ovid, however, gives us an Autolycus of definitely comic enough character to have suggested more than the choice of the name to Shakspere. Nor can his imagination have found anything to stimulate it in Ovid's only other reference to Autolycus, a very casual one, recalling the marriage of the love-child of Hermes with the daughter of the oath-breaker, Erisichtheus,

> qui numina divum
> sperneret et nullos aris adoleret odores.[24]

The son-in-law of Erisichtheus might be one to sleep out the thought of eternity, and perhaps one to sing catches about

> me and my aunts,
> While we lie tumbling in the hay."[25]

Ovid's allusions to him and Homer's, when all are taken together, can hardly have been more than the starting point of Shakspere's interest in him. Authorities as good as Sir Edmund Chambers over-simplify the matter in telling us that Shakspere "took . . . Autolycus from *Odyssey,* xix, 394."[26] The figure there is too shadowy and heroic to have connected itself spontaneously with the one which took shape in Shakspere's imagination, even though we assume him to have been very familiar with Homer. What we should look for as a prototype in the *Odyssey* would be a three-dimensional rogue drawn with the gusto of the portrait of Autolycus' father in the Homeric Hymn to Hermes. But to find anything of that kind we must go to the development of the Greek myth by Italian myth-builders, the first of whom were probably the vulgar tellers of comic yarns about the gods on the streets of Plautus' Rome. The last of them, as we shall see, was the most popular of the Renaissance compilers of mythological lore. In these classical traditions it is certain that we should find one significant part of the background of Shakspere's fancy for the name, Autolycus, and for his enrichment of the character with the "touch of poetry"[27] which President Aydelotte thinks lifts it out of the general run of realistic, English vagabonds.

In the obscure popular mythology of Rome Homer's Autolycus developed into a kind of Jonathan Wild the Great or picaresque Paul Bunyan. As far back as Plautus' allusion to him in the *Bacchides,* the process must have been well advanced. In that play the deluded father, Nicobulus, says, as he awakens to the fact that he has given his money to a sharper,

> Deceptus sum, Autolico hospiti aurum credidi.[28]

Popularly throughout the whole classical period, Autolycus must have been a by-word. So he appears in Martial's use of him as a yardstick to measure the notorious kleptomaniac to whose fists stuck the linen of his hosts and even the shoes of his own children:

> Ne contemne caput; nihil est furacius illo.
> Non fuit Autolici tam piceata manus.[29]

If either of these passages, or others like them, ever came under Shakspere's eye they would suggest an Autolycus

more like his in *The Winter's Tale* than would any of the traditionally cited passages in Homer or Ovid. In the standard editions of Plautus and Martial in the sixteenth century he would find notes duly deriving the name from the *Odyssey,*[30] but the picture in the minds of the annotators came to them from the vulgar mythological lore that found its way to the light in the compilations of the Renaissance mythographers, rather than from the literary sources that they decorously cited. Then, perhaps, because the editor had qualms such as Coleridge felt about the presence of a robber among the inhabitants of Parnassus, he ended his note with some doubts about the exact spot that was his home.

Where the Renaissance mythographers found the story of Autolycus, with the supplements that they added to the classical account, and how it developed in their hands, it is not necessary to inquire. Natale Conti's treatment[31] of it may represent them all. In his chapter on Mercury he turns directly from the account of the god to his son, Autolycus, who became the grandfather of the wily Ulysses, and who inherited the most beggarly of all mortal arts, the art of stealing, from his father. Conti evidently revelled in his virtuosity as a rogue and in the rich hauls that Fortune brought him as unfailingly as she "dropped booties"[32] into the mouth of Shakspere's Autolycus. One of Conti's anecdotes is a tale of Autolycus' detection in the theft of a splendid horse and his success in palming off a mangy ass on his victim as full reimbursement.[33] Another of the tales gives us Autolycus stealing a friend's lovely wife and replacing her with a toothless hag.[34] No one penetrated his impostures, for he inherited his father's command of prestidigitation. Only the cleverest of men, Sisyphus, when his herds had been spirited away, was ready to outwit Autolycus. A sigma branded in the hoofs of his cattle established his ownership. Lost in admiration of Sisyphus' shrewdness, Autolycus asked and got the hand of his daughter, and by her he became the father-in-law of Laertes, whose son Ulysses was to be.[45] At this point Conti quoted and translated the passage in the *Odyssey* to which Sir Edmund Chambers sends us as Shakspere's source for the name and genealogy of his Autolycus. But may we not surmise that stories such as Conti had to tell were more present ferments

in Shakspere's imagination than Homer's meagre passage; and that when he created his tragi-comic rogue the picaresque Autolycus of Plautus and Conti breathed his spirit into the scoundrel at whose ruses the gods "connive"[36] in *The Winter's Tale?*

University of Wisconsin
Madison.

---

[1]Christine White, "A Biography of Autolycus," *The Shakespeare Association Bulletin,* Vol. XIV (July, 1939), pp. 158-168.

[2]*Ibid.,* p. 10.

[3]*The Fraternity of Vagabonds,* edited by A. V. Judges in *The Elizabethan Underworld.* 1930, p. 53.

[4]*The Winter's Tale,* edited by F. W. Moorman in *The Works of William Shakespeare.* London, 1912, IV, iii, 13-14.

[5]*Ibid.,* IV, iii, 27-28.

[6]*Shakespeare's England.* 1917, Vol. II, pp. 483-500.

[7]*The Winter's Tale,* IV, iv, 837-838.

[8]White, *Op. cit.,* 165.

[9]*Ibid.,* 159 and 165.

[10]A. A. Smirnov, *Shakespeare: A Marxist Interpretation.* 1936, p. 87.

[11]Georg Brandes, *William Shakespeare,* translated by William Archer, Mary Morison and Diana White, 1935, p. 641. Insofar as Autolycus is a satirical figure, his direction on the social ladder is not very important. Between his fall from "three-pile" before the opening of *The Winter's Tale* and his recovery of a courtier's status in the last act, he combines the characters of both courtier and cutpurse with others that had long been familiar in dramas like *A Knacke to Knowe a Knave,* and he does his best to rise in most of the callings adopted by the four sons of the Bailiff of Hexham.

[12]Robert Bridges, "On the Influence of the Audience," in The Shakespeare Head Press Edition of *The Works of William Shakespeare,* 1907, Vol. X, p. 331. Mr. Alexander stresses the importance (in *Shakespeare's Life and Art,* 1939, p. 210) of what Mr. Mark Van Doran calls (in *Shakespeare,* 1939, p. 320) "the surpassing roguery of Autolycus" in the merriment of the fourth act of *The Winter's Tale.* The elements of the courtier, the rake and the poet in him are recognized in Mr. Hazelton Spencer's analysis in *The Life and Art of William Shakespeare.* (1940), p. 243.

[13]*Coleridge's Shaksperian Criticism,* edited by Thomas M. Raysor. 2 Vols., 1930. Vol. I, p. 120.

[14]White, *Op. cit.,* 164.

[15]Coleridge, *Op. cit.,* I, 120. Insofar as Autolycus is a criminal and not a playboy, his brags and his amoralism are explicable as Professor E. E. Stoll explains such traits in his chapter on "The Criminals" in *Shakespeare Studies* (1927, p. 337). Mr. Stoll is unquestionably right in asserting (p. 342) that "in no case does Shakespeare represent men as overwhelmed by anything so vague and neutral as social forces."

[16]*The Winter's Tale,* IV, iii, 30-31.

[17]*Ibid.,* IV, iv, 594-595.

[18]*Ibid.,* IV, iv, 828-829.

[19]*Ibid.,* IV, iii, 25.

[20]*King Lear,* edited by William L. Phelps, 1929. Act I, ii, 140-141.

[21]*Ibid.,* I, ii, 131.

[22]*Ovid's Metamorphosis Englished, Mythologiz'd, And Represented in Figures.* By George Sandys, 1632, p. 376.

[23]*The Odysseys of Homer,* translated by George Chapman, edited by Rev. Richard Hooper, 1897, Vl. II, p. 160.

[24]Ovid, *Metamorphoses,* VIII, 739-740.

[25]*The Winter's Tale,* IV, iii, 11-12.

[26]E. K. Chambers, *William Shakespeare,* 1930, Vol. 1, p. 490.

[27]Frank Aydelotte, *Elizabethan Rogues and Vagabonds,* 1913, p. 32.

[28]*T. Macci Plauti Comoediae,* recognovit W. M. Lindsay, Oxford, n. d., *Bacchides,* line 275.

[29]Martial, *Epigrams,* VIII, lix, 1-2.

[30]E. g., the edition of Georgius Alexandrinus, Venice, 1510, pp. XC recto and verso.

[31]*Natalis Comitis Mythologiae, sive Explicationis Fabularum, Eibri Decem,* Frankfurt, 1596.

[32]*The Winter's Tale,* IV, iv, 829.

[33]Memoriae prodidit Zezes hist. 202 chil. 8. Autolycum Laertae patrem, qui fuit auus Vlyssis, omnium prope mortalium pauperrimum artem furandi a Mercurio didicisse, quare ditissimus postea euasit. aiunt hunc tam peritum fuisse latronem, vt cum optimum equum furatus esset, asinum scabie corrosum pro illo restituerit, effeceritque vt eum recipientes minime id sentirent. Conti, *Op. cit.,* p. 443.

[34] . . . atque cum alteri pulcherrimam sponsam rapuisset, anum edentulam, muscosam, & larvam prope restituerit. atque in commutandis mercibus eandem seruabat rationem: nam fuerunt qui praestigiatorum artem a Mercurio excogitatam dixerint. Conti, *Op. cit.,* p. 443.

[35]Hunc astutissimum omnium mortalium fuisse memorant: quippe cum Autolyci sua tempestate insignis & nobilis latronis, qui non solum iureiurando, sed etiam praestigiis ita ita homines decipiebat, vt alias res pro allis caparent, fallacias repulerit. Cum enim greges Sisyphi, qui tunc imperabat Corinthi, Autolycus aliquando occultasset, illosque mutatos reddere conaretur, frustra id egit: quoniam his gregibus Sisyphus suum nomen sub vngulis vna litera contentum inusserat. Id vbi vidisset Autolycus, amicitiam contraxit cum Sisypho, atque illi Anticleam filiem in matrimomum dedit; ex quibus nata est filia eiusdem nominis, quam Laertes pater Vlissis postea vxorem duxit. Conti, *Op. cit.,* p. 629.

[36]*The Winter's Tale,* IV, iv, 673-674.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF "TIMON OF ATHENS"

By RALPH A. HAUG

OF the perplexities that have beset students of Shakspere, few have been more puzzling than those presented by *Timon of Athens*. Heminge and Condell printed it as the fourth of the tragedies, and this, so far as is known, was the first time the play was published. No record has survived of any contemporary stage presentation, although the Folio text bears some evidence of having been printed from an acting version.

Some of the more important problems in *Timon* are these: Did Shakspere write a part of the play or all of it? Is there another hand present in its composition? If there is, whose hand was it, and was the work of the other writer done before or after that of Shakspere? These questions are fundamental. Other problems are the date of composition, the sources of the play, and its obvious, often glaring, mistakes in construction. These problems, to echo Dr. Wright, "present a collection of enigmas as perplexing and as numerous as any play in the Shakespeare canon offers."[1]

Of the theories of dual authorship, the earliest suggestion is that made by Charles Knight, in his *Pictorial Edition* (1838). He argued that Shakspere re-wrote part of an older play by a very inferior dramatist. The weightiest early work for this theory is that of Nikolaus Delius in "Ueber Shakespeare's *Timon of Athens*"[2] (1867). The other side of the question, that an inferior hand has worked over materials at least partly written by Shakspere, was discussed by G. C. Verplanck in 1847 and Benno Tschischwitz in 1869, but the first important modern work was that of F. G. Fleay, whose paper, "On the Authorship of *Timon of Athens*," was read to the New Shakespeare Society in 1874.[3]

Fleay states as his thesis: "The object of the present paper is to shew that the nucleus, the original and only valuable part of the play, is Shakespeare's, and that it was completed for the stage by a second and inferior hand." (p. 130). He opens his paper with a discussion of what is authentic Shaksperian material and what is not. He follows for the most part the esthetic method of judging; that is, by ear. Now

and then he argues by logical elimination to show that two hands must be responsible for errors: for instance, he urges that I, ii, with its confusion of servants and Athenian lords with similar names; and V, iii, in which a soldier, who cannot read, reads an epitaph from a monument, and then takes a rubbing of the verses, are non-Shaksperian errors. The authentic part of *Timon,* Fleay says, was written in 1606,[4] but was not completed. Later this part was used, together with a good deal of bombast, short line verse, defective prose, and rapid dialogue, to fill up 21 pages in the Folio left vacant by the removal of *Troilus and Cressida* to the end of the section of histories. Fleay goes on to ascribe the inferior work to Cyril Tourneur, because he sees a slight resemblance between the inferior passages and *The Revenger's Tragedy* of 1607, but he does not press the point.

Deighton[5] follows much the same reasoning as Fleay, differing on several minor points, mainly the identity of the interpolator. Of him Deighton says: "To me, such work looks like that of some player to whom the editors, failing to find portions known once to have existed, had entrusted the task of putting together the incomplete materials, perhaps . . . made up from actors' copies."

The most lengthy and ingenious work is that of Dr. E. H. Wright, who published his dissertation, *The Authorship of Timon of Athens,* in 1910. Though differing from Fleay, mostly in minor details, his conclusions are the same: "Unless our reasoning is wrong, the singularities and inconsistencies we noted in the play when starting are the product of a man of small ability, writing probably in haste, and seemingly without an intimate acquaintance with the play he was augmenting, or at least without good judgment of its needs. . . . Shakespeare was the first writer to touch the play."[6]

The veteran student, J. M. Robertson, attacked the matter in 1917 in his *Shakespeare and Chapman.* He says (p. 128) by way of introduction: "But if we conceive Shakespeare to have imperfectly recast a faulty play by Chapman, whether or not a third hand meddled later, 'the case is altered,'" and states as his conclusion: "Ill-motivated, ill-plotted, ill-constructed, it [*Timon*] is not such a drama as Shakespeare would have schemed in his maturity. Con-

sidered as an imperfect revision by him of one imperfectly drafted by Chapman, to whom the theme would especially appeal, it becomes newly and completely intelligible" (p. 180).

Robertson, then, goes back to the earliest hypothesis of an inferior play patched up by Shakspere.

Professor T. M. Parrott combines the theories of Robertson and Fleay and his followers. He accepts the "inferior hand" as that of Chapman, but places him second, as the playwright who patched up Shakspere's unfinished work. After his efforts on *Lear* and *Othello* Shakspere was not able to give his best, and, after he had "marked out the way to success and was proceeding along true dramatic lines"[7] he laid the work aside. Later on, perhaps, Professor Parrott thinks, about 1616, the draft was handed to Chapman to revise for a fee. He did not take his task very seriously, and turned in an unplayable mess. This was revised by still a third hand—perhaps someone in the company—and the result was probably at least tried on the stage, but was unsuccessful. This version was given to the Folio printers as copy.

Another theory of the "other hand" is proposed by Mr. H. D. Sykes, who goes back to the older theory, holding that Shakspere worked over an earlier play. Mr. Sykes finds "plain evidence that two authors were concerned in the original play, which Shakespeare revised."[8] The collaborators of the original play were, Mr. Sykes says, John Day and Thomas Middleton. Mr. Dixon Wecter[9] believes that Shakspere wrote a complete Timon play, but was so politically inept as to make it refer glaringly to the evil fortunes of the Earl of Essex. His friends, therefore, had to chop it up and re-write it to make it innocuous, since Shakspere himself was too busy with *Macbeth*. Thus Essex is Timon; Bacon is Ventidius; his friends are the ungrateful Athenians.

Thus we have a number of theories. Fleay, Dr. Wright, and Mr. Deighton follow one line; Mr. Robertson an entirely different track; and Professor Parrott, in reconciling the theories, has added still a third hand, that of an adapter.

Mr. Sykes is able to find two earlier workers who had fingers in the pie. One fact is obvious—there is little agreement among the revisionists, obviously because they cannot agree on their major premises. If one is right, the others must be wrong.

E. K. Chambers makes the latest suggestion (though it is not new, of course), and the one which, in the light of all this disagreement, seems to me the best. Sir Edmund says: "None of the theories seem convincing to me in detail, and their very multiplicity suggests that their exponents are on the wrong tack. Moreover, most of these are compelled to admit that the revision, by whomsoever accomplished, was itself blundering and incomplete. . . . I do not doubt that it was left unfinished by Shakespeare, and I believe that the real solution of the 'problem,' indicated long ago by Ulrici and others, is that it is unfinished still."[10]

It is on this theory, arrived at after a study of the play and the critical evidences presented by holders of all viewpoints, that the arguments of this paper are to be based.

The first of the critics to be discussed may well be Mr. Robertson, since his approach is unique. The others have discussed the validity of the play scene by scene, testing it both esthetically and logically. Mr. Robertson applies the vocabulary test, with odd results. He lists 107 words which appear only in *Timon,* or else in only one or two other plays, usually late ones. I shall give here only the words which are unique in *Timon.* A large number of them occur in Chapman, many of them frequently, Mr. Robertson says, and there is no reason to dispute his assertion. The words are: untirable, confluence, beneath (adj.), glass-faced, propagate, scope, sacrificial, period (verb), unclew, unpeaceable, apperil, dich ("much good dich thy good heart"), sweep (noun), jutting, reliances, dialogue (verb), detention, unaptness, spilth, caked, ingeniously (ingenuously), respectively, solidares, recoverable, outsides, repugnancy, usuring, dividant, rother, fang (verb), wappened, spices (verb), voiced, penurious, trenchant, exhaust, mountant, oathable, hoar (verb), grave (bury), unmeasurable, ensear, conceptious, marbled, liquorish, greases, carper, hinge (verb), approachers, castigate, enforcedly, confectionary, mast

(acorns), composture, exceptless, softness, opulency, patchery (roguery), cauterizing, racanter,[11] sorrow'd, whittle, fragile, traversed, decimation, rampired, regular, insculpture.

At the end of this list, Mr. Robertson remarks: "It is needless to stress the point that seventy words peculiar to one play in the concordance, and thirty to one scene, constitute proof of an alien presence."[12] That such a statement could be made by a critic of Mr. Robertson's scholarly background is almost incredible. Every play of Shakspere has scores of words never used elsewhere: 72 in the early *Two Gentlemen of Verona* and 410 in *Hamlet*. *Timon* itself has not 107, but 166 "onecers," with 31 new compounds. Furthermore, on consulting the *New English Dictionary* I found to be true what anyone might have expected from a glance at the list given above. Most of the words were used, and used frequently, from 1550 to 1650. Only eighteen were found to be really uncommon. These are: beneath (adj.), caked, conceptious, hinge (verb), liquorish, oathable, opulency, reliances, scope, sacrificial, spilth, solidares, sweep (noun), and wappened. Other writers used several of these words as different parts of speech. The words "solidares" and "spilth" are probably coinages. It seems to me that the vocabulary test, on which Mr. Robertson bases most of his argument, is invalid. The presence of Chapman's work in the play has not, of course, been disproved, but has been reduced to a mere assertion.

The other critics of *Timon* have discussed the play scene by scene, attributing this to Shakspere, that to the other playwrights, according to esthetic and logical analysis. In the succeeding pages I shall examine a few scenes, sample the work in them, and try to demonstrate my thesis. Scenes which by common consent are attributed to Shakspere may be ignored.

A glance at the list of parts attributed to Shakspere will show that most critics, with the exception of Professor Parrott, give by far the greater share of the first scene to him. It is in the second scene of Act I that we first encounter real difficulties. We find here long lines which will not scan; short lines which neither scan nor fit in with

others; prose breaking into verse sixteen times; wretched couplets of doggerel; and dramatic mistakes a-plenty. Yet there are definite Shaksperian touches throughout. Consider the opening lines:

> Most honored Timon,
> It hath pleased the gods to remember my father's age
> And call him to long peace. (I, ii, 1-3).

The scansion is rough, yet the sound of these lines is Shakspere's. It seems fair to suggest that the idea of the lines is here set down, the scansion to be worked out completely later.

None of the critics who do not allow him the entire play ascribes any part of this scene to Shakspere. When we come to lines like these, we begin to wonder:

> I scorn thy meat; 'T would choke me, for I should ne'er flatter thee. O you gods, what a number of men eats Timon and he sees 'em not. It grieves me to see so many dip their meat in one man's blood; and all the madness is, he cheers them up too.
> I wonder men dare trust themselves with men
> Methinks they should invite them without knives;
> Good for their meat, and safer for their lives. (I, ii, 38-46).

This, of course, is Apemantus speaking, and this cynical butt may be permitted to talk this way. But a few lines later Timon, who in the first scene had spoken winged words, gives this sermon:

> O, no doubt, my good friends, but the Gods themselves have provided that I shall have much help from you; how had you been my friends else? Why have you that charitable title from thousands, did you not chiefly belong to my heart? I have told more of you to myself than you can with modesty speak in your own behalf; and thus far I confirm you. O you Gods, think I, what need we have any friends, if we should ne'er have need of 'em? They were the most needless creatures living should we ne'er have use for 'em, and would most resemble sweet instruments hung up in cases that keep their sounds to themselves. (I, ii, 90-103).

The masque in this scene has been criticized. "This is tragedy," critics say. "A masque has its place in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* or *The Tempest,* but not here in a tragedy of hate." But, as Professor Knight has noted,[13] this early part of Timon's existence is filled with wealth, joy, luxury. He is the dispenser of happiness to everyone.

And in no way could this idea be better staged than by a masque. Professor Parrott (p. 10) notes that Chapman was fond of introducing masques. He cannot have forgotten that Shakspere likewise used them.

The verse of the scene is most irregular. Sometimes it seems to have the true note of Shakspere:

> I take all and your several visitations
> So kind to heart, 'tis not enough to give;
> Methinks I could deal kingdoms to my friends
> And ne'er be weary. Alcibiades,
> Thou art a soldier, therefore seldom rich. (I, ii, 226-230).

But then we come upon other lines like these:

> His promises fly so beyond his state
> That what he speaks is all in debt; he owes
> For every word; he is so kind that he now
> Pays interest for't; his land's put to their books.
> (I, ii, 204-207).

or like these

> But yond man is ever angry.
> Go, let him have a table by himself,
> For he does neither affect company
> Nor is he fit for it, indeed.
> (I, ii, 29-32).

We do not know Shakspere's methods of composition. But it is impossible to believe that he turned out his work literally never "blotting a line." Surely there must have been much toil and sweat of the study. As has been said above, what I suggest for this scene, and for all the "imperfect" scenes of the play, is that we have here a rough draft, the first sketch of a drama, in which some parts are complete, some in a state approaching completion, and others in a chaotic condition. Such an hypothesis would explain short lines—the idea is there, but the words were tardy; it explains long lines—the ideas were clothed in too many words; it explains chaotic passages as rough notes that could be worked over later into a finished scene; and it explains the frequent dramatic mistakes that have led many critics to see the hand of an adapter.

Mr. Wright (p. 57) gives a verse analysis of the scene. He finds that feminine endings are 15 percent, whereas the

true "Shaksperian" part of *Timon* has 22 percent; run-on lines, 12 percent, "Shaksperian," 27 percent; rimes, 21 percent, against 4 per cent. In scattered bits like these the verse test does not seem to have much significance. For one thing, we do not know the exact date of the play, and Shakpere's metre varied in different periods of his career; and, furthermore, he was not bound to any metrical system at any time.

The many errors in the scene have been used to prove dual authorship. But anyone who would be employed to revise the play would be a man of the theatre. Chapman, Tourneur, Day, Middleton were skillful dramatists. I cannot see that they would be more likely than Shakspere to make a number of little mistakes, either as original authors or revisers. And if Mr. Robertson is correct, and Shakspere revised this work of Chapman, he surely would give little evidence of having learned much about the construction of plays in his fifteen years in the theatre had he turned in the play as it is. On the basis of the mistakes, the revision theory would leave one or both who had a part in the play miserable bunglers; a theory that *Timon* is an unrevised first draft leaves no one responsible, since we may feel sure that they would have been eliminated in revision.

What are these errors? Ventidius (Ventigius, sometimes, in the Folio) who had been released from jail, becomes an heir on the death of his father and comes to Timon's banquet—all this in about fifteen minutes (I,ii,1-7). This is an error that a writer might easily make with a minor character, but one which a reviser would pounce upon at once. The steward is called Flavius here, but that is evidently not his name (I, ii, 162). (The Folio here calls him *Flavius,* but later *Stew.*). A servant announces senators to the feast, but the senators do not come in (line 180). Timon says that he plans to make a gift to Alcibiades, but nothing more is heard of it (line 227). It seems much more plausible that these are the errors of the author, working rapidly, rather than the work of a reviser.

Act II, scene i, is, by everybody, save Mr. Robertson, who sees a Chapman base, considered to be Shakspere's. No special pleading is necessary. The whole scene is compact;

the plot, which rather lagged through the first act, begins to tighten; and the verse has the terse, swift-moving quality of Shakspere's narrative. Furthermore, the scene scans, has little rhyme, and fulfills, according to Mr. Wright, all the requirements of good Shaksperian verse.

How shall we reconcile this excellent verse with the halting patchwork scene which precedes? I believe the reason for its finished state is in the fact that the plot definitely tightens here. Timon's fortune, built on lavishness, is about to collapse. It is a key place in the drama. In casting up his play, Shakspere first completed these necessary scenes. Perhaps these were parts he saw most clearly.

Lines 1-46 of the second scene need not concern us. Even Professor Parrott ascribes the scene to Shakspere. The next section, lines 47-131, has been invariably ascribed to the other hand and merits examination.

The passage, in prose, is a flyting match between Apemantus and various servants. The prose here is not fragmentary—one cannot call it notes or jottings. But it is hasty. The inevitable error is there. Two letters are brought in by a page, one to Timon and one to Alcibiades, from a whore; Shakspere probably meant to do something with them, but forgot. The later association of Timon and Alcibiades is significant. The other errors are slight, but that of the letters is important. A reviser or interpolator would have no possible point in introducing them, since he was not making the plot. The rest of the scene is usually called Shakspere's; Dr. Wright excepts line 192. A single sample will show the authentic ring:

> So the Gods bless me,
> When all our offices have been oppress'd
> With riotous feeders, when our vaults have wept
> With drunken spilth of wine, when every room
> Hath blaz'd with lights, and bray'd with minstrelsy,
> I have retir'd me to a wasteful cock
> And set mine eyes at flow. (II, ii, 162-168).

The plot moves forward rapidly in this part of the scene. Timon is apprized of his ruin, but he is still confident, sure that his friends will help him.

The first three scenes of Act III produce good evidence

of the trouble to which following a theory too closely will lead. Fleay and some others have ascribed the following lines in II, ii (excellent narrative prose, quite worthy of Shakspere) to the reviser:

> *Tim.* I will dispatch you severally. You to Lord Lucius, to Lord Lucullus you; I hunted with his honor today; you to Sempronius; commend me to their loves; and I am proud, say, that my occasions have found time to use 'em toward a supply of money; let the request be fifty talents. (II, ii, 196-202).

Therefore, the results of these lines—the scenes in which Timon's requests for loans are refused—must be the reviser's work as well; Shakspere could not have written one without writing the other. These scenes are excellent in characterization and dialogue, vastly better than some of the other condemned sections.

In III, ii, 29-41 we have an example of what must surely be hasty, incomplete writing. Timon's servant, Servillius, asks Lord Lucius for "so many talents" (line 39) and Lucius retorts: "He cannot want fifty five hundred talents." Had the reviser written the order to the servants to get fifty talents, he would surely have remembered it, for it was he, say the critics, who had only shortly before written the lines quoted above. The "so many" sounds like words put in until the exact amount could be checked. Similarly with "fifty five hundred talents"—a sum amounting to over a million pounds. I believe that the two amounts "50" and "500" were put down in Shakspere's manuscript, until one could be checked and crossed out. As the play was never finished, this was never done.

Of the fourth scene, Dr. Wright has this to say (p. 43):

> "There is little need, if any, for a second dunning scene in the play. It is therefore likely, *a priori,* that the superfluous scene, repeating one of Shakespeare's, is the other authors." [The other dunning scene had been II, ii, 50ff.]

No doubt Timon's utter ruin could have been shown otherwise. But the scene serves at least three important dramatic purposes: first, it shows the hypocrisy of the fair-weather friends by contrasting them with their servants, who are honester men than they; second, it introduces Timon in his rage, his *saeva indignatio* (it is the first time

he is seen after his ruin); third, the invitation to the mock-banquet is given here. If only one dunning scene is held necessary, why not only one love scene in *Romeo and Juliet?* or why waste space in an over-long play with more than one scene showing Hamlet's hesitation?[14]

Mr. Wright brands (p. 43) much of the verse in this scene as "positively silly," and, when not quite that, the "style is mediocre." This he must apply to such lines as these:

> 'Tis deepest winter in Lord Timon's purse;
> That is, one may reach deep enough, and yet
> Find little. (III, iv, 14-16).

and to

> What, are my doors oppos'd against my passage?
> Have I been ever free, and must my house
> Be my retentive enemy, my gaol?
> The place which I have feasted, does it now,
> Like all mankind, show me an iron heart?
> (III, iv, 80-84).

But it is perhaps unfair to quote only the best of the scene. There is not much of this nobler verse here—the action precludes it; we have no right to look for great poetry in a dunning scene. For the most part, the scene is the rapid talk of the servants. Let us note some of it:

> *Phil.* Good day at once.
> *Luci* Welcome good brother.
> What do you think of the hour?
> *Phil.* Laboring for nine.
> *Luci.* So much?
> *Phil.* Is not my lord seen yet? (III, iv, 7-10).

This terse, clear dialogue serves the purpose of showing Timon's concealment—his actual hiding—from his creditors. The faithful steward's[15] speech, likewise, certainly is not contemptible:

> Why then preferred you not your sums and bills
> When your false masters eat of my lord's meat?
> Then they could smile, and fawn upon his debts,
> And take down th' interest into their glutt'nous maws.
> (III, iv, 48-51).

The entire scene, rejected by the critics, is dramatically necessary, a development of the characters of Timon and

the steward, and is not beneath the admiration of fair criticism. It is most surely not "contemptible" and "ragged."

III, v, is rejected by all the critics, Chapman of course being the candidate of Professor Parrott and Mr. Robertson, the others choosing the "unknown hand." To get Alcibiades banished from Athens, to make him an enemy of the state, he is depicted defending an unknown friend for an unknown crime. Mercy being denied, Alcibiades is himself banished.

The only dramatic weakness of the scene is its surprise. Since there is no connection with what has gone before, we are not ready for it. But a motivation of Alcibiades' later hatred of Athens is necessary to the plot:

> Banishment!
> It comes not ill, I hate not to be banished;
> It is a cause worthy my spleen and fury,
> That I may strike at Athens. (III, v, 112-115).

The verse of the scene, "mediocre," Mr. Wright calls it, is not so contemptible as he thinks. The opening address of Alcibiades to the senate:

> I am an humble suitor to your virtues;
> For pity is the virtue of the law,
> And none but tyrants use it cruelly. (III, v, 6-8).

has at least some of the feeling of Othello's great speech to another senate. And the rest of the verse throughout the scene has the same note of dignity and high-mindedness. There are some irregularities, particularly short lines. Professor Parrott cites them as examples of cutting, but these short lines fit the context perfectly. Either extraordinary care was used in cutting, or there was none. In the irregular lines Mr. Wright sees the inferior hand. Let us examine a few of them: "He did oppose his foe" (l. 20).

Is it impossible to consider this a first draft, a note of the thought, which could be expanded later?

> To bring manslaughter into form, and set quarrelling
> Upon the head of valour. (Ll.27-28).

In its context, these lines are clear enough. They seem another rough draft.

To kill, I grant, is sin's extremest gust;
But in defense, by Mercy, 'tis most just.
To be in anger, is impiety;
But who is man, that is not angry? (Ll. 55-58).

No one would call these lines the finished work of Shakspere. They are not necessarily chaotic—they are simply rough jottings unfinished. The argument that says the best and worst lines of this scene are both the completed work of one man does not seem tenable. As in any piece of work left unfinished, some parts are much better done than others.

All critics unite in giving the best of III, vi, 93-110, to Shakspere, even though the end of the scene has two couplets. Mr. Wright would not assign to Shakspere the scene in which the guests were invited, but ascribes this later scene to him on the ground that he wrote the scene in which the two guests, "obviously Lucullus and Lucius," turned Timon's servants down. (Mr. Wright has been one of the few to ascribe the rejection scenes to Shakspere.) We need not go into the scene. It is the climax of the play; it has some excellent invective, the prose is somewhat better than that of, say, I, ii, and the verse gives no indication of incompleteness.

No question has been raised over IV, i. The curse of Timon on Athens is like that of Lear for Goneril, though Timon's is longer and more circumstantial. A few lines will show its quality:

Lust and liberty
Creep in the minds and marrows of our youth,
That 'gainst the stream of virtue they may strive,
And drown themselves in riot! Itches, blains,
Sow all the Athenian bosoms, and their crop
Be general leprosy. (IV, i, 25-30).

Fleay and Rolfe deny Shakspere any part of IV, ii, although Mr. Wright and Professor Parrott agree that, at least for the first thirty lines, its authorship has not been doubted. The first part is the affecting leave-taking of the servants—perhaps the most moving lines in the play. The concluding twenty-one form a sententious monologue for the steward. There are several short lines.

Sententious verse in couplets does not sound well to the modern ear. But the Elizabethans had not passed through a reaction against moralizing—they approved it heartily. Shakspere used couplets in many of his later plays, not considering, of course, the couplets concluding speeches or scenes. Compare *Lear,* I, i, 183-190, I, ii, 257-267, III, vi, 110-120 (Q1), V, iii, 319-326; and *Othello,* I, iii, 201-220, and II, i, 149-160. Each of these passages is very similar to the one in *Timon* in purpose—sententious self-communion. It is obvious, then, that the fact of the couplets proves nothing against our case. Shakspere used them; so did his fellows. There is a clue in this passage to the significance of the short lines: none of them rhyme, though many of the full lines do. If they were not meant to stand as they are, and I believe they were not, the lack of rhymes among them points to hasty writing. The unrhyming lines (in the passages from *Lear* and *Othello,* all the lines are couplets) in *Timon* may indicate hasty writing at a time when the rhymes did not come readily.

In the third scene the critics have been very ingenious in patching up a kind of Chinese puzzle of ascriptions. None has chopped it up in quite the same way; Professor Parrott has been the most successful: he has broken it into seven pieces, ascribing them to Shakspere, Chapman, and the unknown reviser, on much the same evidence as the others. There is nothing in the scene that illustrates anything new, so we need not discuss it at any length. The delayed entrance of the poet and the painter has been laid to the reviser, and made much of. But it may mean only a slip of the memory. It will be remembered that, in line 337, Apemantus announces their arrival, but they do not enter until some two hundred lines have been spoken, the banditti and the steward entering meanwhile. A reviser would have pounced upon such an error; Shakspere simply changed his mind as he went along, and never returned to correct his mistake.

Act five has the surest evidence of hasty work found in the play. An illiterate soldier has taken a wax impression of the inscription on Timon's tomb, and presents it to Alcibiades to read. The inscription is:

> Here lies a wretched corse, of wretched soul bereft;

> Seek not my name. A plague consume you wicked caitiffs left.
> Here lie I, Timon, who, alive, all living men did hate;
> Pass by and curse thy fill, but pass and stay not here thy gait.
> (V, iv, 70-73).

This, of course, is really two contrasting epitaphs, copied almost verbatim from North's *Plutarch*. What happened seems obvious. Shakspere noted both down, intending later to delete one. Shakspere never returned to *Timon,* hence both epitaphs remain. That a reviser would have gone to the trouble of seeking out another epitaph is impossible.

There is one scene in act five that saddens anyone loyal to the Shaksperian authorship theory. The third scene cannot be called unfinished, for the lines are regular enough. Its utter flatness reminds us that Shakspere could, sometimes, write very badly. I shall quote a few lines from it (it is only ten lines long).

> By all description this should be the place.
> Who's here? speak, ho! No answer! What is this?
> Timon is dead, who hath outstretch'd his span.
> Some beast read this? there does not live a man.
> Dead, sure, and this his grave. What's on this tomb?
> I cannot read; the character I'll take with wax.
> (V, iii, 1-6).

The lines are all end-stopped but one; the concluding couplet is very bad. However, this is merely a short "functional" scene; it carries on a necessary action of the play, and it was meant to do no more. Furthermore, only an illiterate soldier is talking; there was no reason why he should speak winged words.

There is, of course, no absolute proof possible in such a discussion as this. I think it can be definitely shown that Mr. Robertson's "proof" of Chapman's hand is nonsense, but we have not ruled Chapman out—merely made him improbable. On purely esthetic grounds it would be pleasant to agree with Fleay and his followers, but such critical softness would lead to all kinds of monstrosities. It seems fair to say that the following ideas about *Timon of Athens* may be based on truth:

Part of the verse in the play seems to be a hasty jotting of ideas mixed with lines which may or may not be finished. (It is not, of course, taken for granted that a verse is in its complete, final form simply because it has ten syllables and

scans.) A few examples of unfinished verse, taken from the parts called non-Shaksperian, will recapitulate this idea:

> Heyday,
> What a sweep of vanity comes this way.
> They dance? They are mad women.
> Like madness is the glory of this life,
> As this pomp shews to a little oil and root.
> We make ourselves fools to disport ourselves,
> And spend our flatteries, to drink those men
> Upon whose age we void it up again.
> (I, ii, 134-141).

The speech is sententious, and was probably intended to rhyme throughout. The lines are extraordinarily obscure, as they might well be if they were mere notes of the meaning, to be completed later.[16]

Another example, to the same effect:

> This was my lord's best hope; now all are fled,
> Save the Gods only. Now his friends are dead,
> Doors, that were ne'er acquainted with their wards
> Many a bounteous year, must be employ'd
> Now to guard their master:
> And this is all a liberal course allows;
> Who cannot keep his wealth must keep his house.
> (III, iii, 36-42).

Here the short line, in the midst of a sententious passage, is almost certainly a note, which later revision was to expand, and, perhaps, another line was to be inserted. The numerous passages in *Lear,* for example, prove beyond question Shakspere's use of this form for moralizing.

The second great objection of the critics is that the prose is bad—Fleay rejects every word of it. Prose, of course, must be judged on esthetic and dramatic lines. Let us look at a few passages of the part usually rejected: first, the speech of the fool:

> I think no usurer but has a fool to his servant: my mistress is one, and I am her fool. When men come to borrow of your masters, they approach sadly, and go away merry; but they enter my mistress' house merrily, and go away sadly. (II, ii, 101-105).

This is terse, crisp prose. We cannot prove that Shakspere wrote it, but there is no reason for thinking that he did not. Similarly:

> If thou wert the lion, the fox would beguile thee; if thou wert the

> lamb, the fox would eat thee; if thou wert the fox, the lion would suspect thee, etc. (IV, iii, 325-29).

It is hard to dogmatize about prose, although most of the critics do. But though Mr. Wright calls the scene from which the above lines are taken "vaudeville," and Professor Parrott calls it a *faux pas,* I cannot see in them anything save Shakspere at something less than his best.

The third important reason for suspecting the presence of a reviser has been the mistakes, all of them errors of no great importance, and obvious on careful reading. As I pointed out before, these errors seem a stronger proof of hasty writing than of anything else. Of course, a mistake is much more obvious in the study than on the stage, and Shakspere was seldom careful to keep his work free from small blunders.

Mistakes due to haste are probably such errors as the following: that of Ventidius (I, ii, 1-8); the names of the servants, Flavius, the steward, and Flaminius; the delayed entrance of the poet and painter; the "fifty five hundred talents" (III, ii, 41); and the double epitaph (V, iv, 70-73). An error which seems to indicate a forgotten intention is that of the letters of the whore to Timon and Alcibiades (II, ii, 85-90) since they may connect with the venereal disease speeches later. The same may be true of the lack of a denial scene with Ventidius.

Where the verse (and sometimes the prose) is excellent, finished, clear, there is no question of its authorship, and where the verse halts and the prose is dull the critics see another hand at work. It would be good to believe that the "greatest and most comprehensive soul" never writ badly, and that, whenever there is a part we do not like, it is a corruption, the work of an adapter or reviser or prompter or printer. But such bardolatry, which led Coleridge to reject the Porter scene because he did not like it, is dangerous. Sir Edmund Chambers says (p. 207): "The folio must be regarded as the chief authority for the main range of Shakspere . . . and it requires deference as coming from men who were in the best position to know the facts. A desire to do justice to a dead 'fellow' and some care taken in the work are apparent enough in the epistles." Shak-

spere's old colleagues were honest men, honestly trying to honor his memory. They did, it is true, include *Henry VIII,* which shows the work of another hand. But the student must not accept this as the basis for an *a priori* assumption in dealing with any play which, like *Timon,* has parts open to suspicion. He must accept the Folio as presumptive evidence that the plays are Shakspere's until the contrary has been proved. He must not take the inclusion of other men's work here and there as a basis for a general suspicion of the canon.

The final objection to the critics is on esthetic grounds. From the time of Fleay the custom in criticizing the play has been that followed in the first part of this paper—breaking it up into parts and judging on the basis of fragments. But such an approach misses the most vital point about a play—that the whole is greater than the parts, and that if Shakspere discarded the classical unities, there was unity of tone, of design, of effect in his plays, the only kind of unity that matters. If this unity is not present in our play, there may be genuine reason to doubt its authorship; if it is present, it is almost impossible to see how there can be two hands working on it.

Timon of Athens is called by Professor Knight "The Pilgrimage of Hate." From a lord of golden kindness and benevolence, he is plunged into such loathing, such hatred of all human kind, as is found in no other of Shakspere's plays. His hatred is not aimed at individuals, it is universal. The hate is carried through, growing in intensity. In *Lear* the good triumphs in death. For the old man, the last horror of Cordelia's death endured, death is a kindly deliverance:

> Vex not his ghost: O, let him pass! He hates him much
> That would upon the rack of this tough world
> Stretch him out longer. (*Lear,* V, iii, 313-315).

The evil people, hoist on their own petard, are destroyed by their sins. So it is in *Macbeth* and *Othello* and *Hamlet,* each in its degree. But in *Timon* we have no interest in the punishment of the treacherous friends. All our interest is centered upon Timon and his hate. Ulrici is correct when he says: "His character, although by no means unnatural, is, nevertheless, of such an unusual type, such a mere ex-

ception to the rule, that he cannot excite us to any personal sympathy."[17] He has summed up the bitter tragedy of the play: "Even in *Macbeth* the conciliatory element of tragedy, the mild splendour of the setting sun, such as spread over Romeo's, Lear's, and Hamlet's death, is removed far into the background. . . . The shadows continue to become deeper, 'till finally in *Timon of Athens* we have the full darkness of night" (p. 531).

So all our attention is centered, then, upon this "pilgrimage" of Timon, from the point where he says:

> You mistake my love;
> I gave it freely ever; and there's none
> Can truly say he gives, if he receives;
> If our betters play at that game, we must not dare
> To imitate them; faults that are rich are fair.
> (I, ii, 9-13).

until, in the very ecstasy of hate, he bids the whores:

> Consumptions sow
> In hollow bones of man; strike their sharp shins,
> And mar men's spurring. Crack the lawyers voice
> That he may never more false title plead,
> Nor sound his quillets shrilly; hoar the flamen
> That scolds against the quality of flesh
> And not believes himself: down with the nose,
> Down with it flat; take the bridge quite away
> Of him that, his particulars to foresee
> Smells from the general weal. (IV, iii, 150-158).

and so to the end:

> Come not to me again; but say to Athens,
> Timon hath made his everlasting mansion
> Upon the beachëd verge of the salt flood;
> Who once a day with his embossed froth
> The turbulent surge shall cover: thither come,
> And let my gravestone be your oracle.
> Lips, let sour words go by and language end:
> What is amiss plague and infection mend!
> Graves only be men's works and death their gain!
> Sun, hide thy beams! Timon hath done his reign.
> (V, i, 217-226).

Critics have considered the motivation in *Timon* insufficient. What they miss is that Shakspere made his motives to suit his people—Hamlet a murdered father and strumpeted mother, Othello a handkerchief, and a villian's innu-

endoes; Coriolanus the loss of the consulship, Lear the ungratefulness of children. To Timon, who had lived in a universe of love, the shattering realization that there was no love was motive enough.

There is unity of effect, secured through the progress of the character of Timon. There is little progress through action. Compared with the action of *Lear,* with which it is closest allied, *Timon* is rather static. Though it is a tragedy, no one is killed; Timon dies a natural death. It is thus a tragedy of mood and character, not one of action.

Do the scenes called "spurious" add to this mood, retard it, or simply ignore it? What is their relation to the plot? If it can be shown, in a few disputed scenes, that they fit both, another strong supposition of Shakspere's authorship will have been established.

A good share of I, i, has been denied Shakspere by Professor Parrott, Mr. Robertson and others. The scene introduces Timon by having him described by his admirers. *Coriolanus* and *Julius Caesar* begin in much the same way. The affluent, genial Timon is shown in benevolent action, and Apemantus, the professional cynic, is brought in. He is rough, crude, vulgar—but how else could he be? This is Shakspere's concept of him. Furthermore, the scene is evidently planned to introduce every character of any importance,—they all make their appearance here.

The second scene is always rejected. It develops the character of Timon, further contrasts him with Apemantus, and, by his largesse, prepares us for the ingratitude to come. The tone of richness and happiness is heightened by the masque. When Mr. Wright (p. 36) calls this scene "dead waste" he forgets that the design of the play has been started and that this scene is the foundation of all that is to come. The effect of gold, effortless luxury, has been achieved.

The second act begins the awakening of Timon. His creditors begin to draw in on him. Most have recognized that this part of the plot must be by Shakspere, but they are horrified again at Apemantus. They have missed Shakspere's idea of him as boorish, obscene, and dirty. The speeches of Apemantus throughout are in keeping with his character.

The third act gives the rejection of Timon by his friends. This section, the motive of Timon's hatred, the climax of the play, is denied to Shakspere—because the servants are not differentiated. Furnivall saw clearly that the rejection scenes must belong to Shakspere: "I cannot believe that Shakspere would make the ingratitude of one man [Ventidius] the sole cause of Timon's entire change of character."[18] If the first three scenes of this act are rejected, we are forced to assume that Shakspere gives us Timon in his rage without showing us why; that he never troubled to show us why Timon had such soul-shaking hatred.

"There is little need, if any, for a second dunning scene in the play," says Dr. Wright (p. 43). Therefore the fourth scene of the third act is discarded. This is to say, there is no need for us to know Timon's utter ruin, no need for us to see, for the first time, his *saeva indignatio,* no need for the invitation to the mock banquet. The tone has changed, has grown into harshness and cruelty. No need to develop this effect for what is to come?

I do not greatly admire the banishment scene of Alcibiades. But it is in the mood of the play. As Knight says (pp.235-36): "It suggests that Athens is suffering from an ingrateful and effete generation, greedy and mean." And "The theme of Alcibiades is closely woven with that of Timon, and both endure ingratitude from the senate." Ingratitude, and hate springing from it, is the theme of Alcibiades as well as Timon.

From this point the argument may be merely sketched. The mock banquet, with its fine climax, "Uncover, dogs, and lap," is of course necessary to establish the final, complete loathing of Timon for his kind. In the scene of the parting of the servants there is a contrasting touch of human love, which is touching. From the banquet Timon's hatred grows blacker. He finds gold, but it pleases him no more, save as an instrument of evil. For Alcibiades, the whores, Apemantus, his old parasites, the bandits, his hate grows deeper. Only the steward, for a few moments, stops the outpouring of loathing that continues to the end.

Other scenes could be used, but it is obvious that *Timon*

of Athens has one tone, continued throughout; one effect and this effect Shaksperian. This must establish a strong probability that this play is by one author, and that author is Shakspere.

Eveleth, Minn.

---

[1]E. H. Wright, *The Authorship of Timon of Athens.* 1910, p. vii.

[2]In *Jahrbuch der deutschen Shakespeare Gesellschaft,* Vol. II.

[3]*Transactions of the New Shakespeare Society,* 1874.

[4]Other datings offered for *Timon* are: Deighton (in *Arden Shakespeare*), 1606-10, E. K. Chambers, 1608. My own surmise is that it is of the period 1606-1608.

[5]*Timon of Athens,* (New York, 1905), p. xxi.

[6]Wright, pp. 101-102.

[7]T. M. Parrott, *The Problem of Timon of Athens,* 1923, p. 28.

[8]"The Problem of *Timon of Athens,*" in *Sidelights on Elizabethan Drama* (1924), pp. 1-48. (p. 2).

[9]"Shakespeare's Purpose in *Timon of Athens*", PMLA, XLIII (1928), pp. 701-721.

[10]*William Shakespeare, A Study of Facts and Problems* (1930), vol. 1, p. 482.

[11]Robertson, pp. 145-150.

[12]*Ibid.,* pp. 150-151.

[13]*The Wheel of Fire,* (1930), p. 229.

[14]Here is a case where the critics are hoist with their own petard. A while back they denied scenes III, i, ii, iii, to Shakspere because he had not written the ten lines which make the scene logical. Here, on the other hand, they do not allow Shakspere the invitation to the banquet, but they do give him the banquet.

[15]Is the steward's name Flavius? In the Folio, I, ii, 160, Timon calls him Flavius, and the speech headings call him *Fla.* In II, ii, 190, however, Timon is talking *to* his steward, and calls for Flavius. The three servants who go to Timon's false friends, however, are Servillius, Flaminius, and "a third servant." It is a case, I believe, of Shakspere's forgetting these conventionalized Athenian names. Nothing could be more likely to happen in rapid composition. There is, likewise, some confusion about Lucius. In I, ii, 187, he presents Timon with "Four milk-white horses, trapp'd with silver." In III, ii, he is out of money when Timon wishes to borrow. The list of actors' names in the Folio makes an added difficulty, for here there is a Lucius who is servant to a usurer. I do not find it as hard as Mr. Wright to believe that the same man could give a splendid gift—with the expectation of getting it back tenfold,—decline a loan, and press at once for an older debt. Probably there is only one Lucius, and the servant gets his name from his master.

As for the list of characters in the Folio: *Timon* ends on page 98, and the extra leaf —actors' names on one side, blank on the other, fills out a printer's "take"—three sheets, six leaves, twelve pages. It is clear that this list was hastily prepared in the print-shop to fill one side of the blank leaf. It is the only list of this kind in the Folio. The list is most inaccurate, and has no authority. It omits the following: the steward, Lucilius, the fool, and the two courtezans, Timandra and Phyrnia.

[16]It is to be noted that these "spurious" lines are sometimes obscure to the point of unintelligibility, and again, as in V, iii, plain to the point of childishness. Yet the critics say the same unknown wrote both.

[17]*Shakespeare's Dramatic Art,* 1875, p. 531.

[18]*New Shakespeare Society Trans.* (London, 1874), p. 243.

SHAKSPERE FOR PLEASURE

By I. C. KELLER

THERE are two possible approaches to the study of Shakspere—the scholarly and the pleasurable. In a limited number of students the two are combined; to them the scholarly is the pleasurable. They are interested in discovering the chronology of the plays or the date of a single play. To this end they carefully scrutinize internal and external evidence, the prevalence of rhyme, the kind of blank verse used, the frequency with which puns appear, and other such scholarly matters. They attempt to determine whether the play came entirely from the pen of the great dramatist or whether some contemporary collaborated in its writing. To this inner group of scholars the world is indebted for the accumulated mass of Shaksperian knowledge we are fortunate enough to possess. The extent of this debt can not be overestimated, for it has made possible the approach to be discussed in this paper—the pleasurable.

By this approach I mean the popular, the interest that millions reveal in sitting down to read a play with a fair degree of understanding, or paying a small sum to attend the theatre and enjoy the thrill an excellent performance gives. This is the uncritical approach, one that does not require the critical insight of the scholar. However, there are certain essentials which one should possess if this approach is to furnish the desired pleasure.

In the first place, a satisfying knowledge of the Elizabethan Age will greatly help. This knowledge will include some understanding of the steps through which the English drama came up to this age, why the age was dramatic, what the condition of the theater was, and the nature of the audience that attended plays. It will also include a somewhat comprehensive knowledge of the literary and social conditions, and other factors influencing the production and presentation of the drama. All this background knowledge will greatly increase the pleasure the plays brings to the reader or the listener.

In the second place, some familiarity with plays written by dramatists other than Shakspere will intensify this pleas-

ure. No one can fully appreciate Shakspere's genius until he has read some of the plays written by other Elizabethan dramatists. In such plays as *The Alchemist, The Duchess of Malfi, The Shoemaker's Holiday, A Woman Killed with Kindness, Philaster,* and other well-known plays of this period the pleasure seeker will find much that will interest and please him, but he will miss more. The tragic power revealed in *The Duchess of Malfi* will impress him, but it will also make him appreciate more fully the superiority of *Hamlet, Macbeth, King Lear,* and the other great Shaksperian tragedies. Through this contrast he will come to marvel at the incomparable dramatic artistry of Shakspere; he will better understand relative greatness in the world of drama; he will come to appreciate the application of such descriptive words as poor, fair, good, excellent, and great, when applied to the drama.

Then, if he really wants to add to the pleasurable interest, he will want to know something about the man who wrote these enduring dramas. True, he will soon discover that our actual, recognized knowledge is painfully limited —that tradition and legend are often substituted for authenticated facts. Of course, he will understand that few records were kept then of the lives of the middle and lower classes and will fit this fact into the meagerness of our knowledge of the man Shakspere. He will marvel that such a man and such dramas could come from such limited opportunities. He will put together the data the scholars have assembled and use these facts as a background against which to project his pleasurable quest.

Finally, after some investigation in the great Elizabethan Age, some reading of dramas by other dramatists, and increased intimacy with the known facts of the dramatist's life, the Shaksperian seeker will come to the plays themselves—the real object of his search for pleasure. Naturally his curiosity will lead him to ask where the dramatist got his material for all his varied plays. If the ancient Israelites couldn't make bricks without straw, neither can a dramatist write dramas without suitable material. A hasty glance into Holinshed's *Chronicles,* Plutarch's *Lives,* and various old plays and stories, followed by the study of the plays in which these materials were used, will reveal the

marvelous skill of the master dramatist. One concrete example will heighten his admiration. If he reads Mark Antony's speech in *Julius Caesar,* he will be in a position to appreciate Shakspere's incomparable skill in adapting material for dramatic use.

Then, too, he will enjoy the great variety of plots used in the plays. In the development of these interesting plots he will find satisfaction for his love of unusual stories. How an Iago skilfully controls every character his life touches, how a Lear-plot and a Gloster-plot are woven together to form a unified whole, how a philosophical Hamlet through proscrastination brings destruction to friend and foe, how the ambition of a Macbeth and his queen ends in total tragedy, how Portia helps to bring about the triumph of justice—these and many other stories forming the plots of the plays will bring keen pleasure to the reader of Shakspere.

At first, he may find some difficulty in pronouncing and understanding the meaning of some of the words used, but modern editions will help him to overcome this difficulty. If he is a student of language, such words as *presently, dear, cashiered, doubt,* and many others will challenge him and stimulate his interest in the study of language past and present. He will marvel that a man who was supposed to know "little Latin and less Greek" possessed such a mastery of the language of his day. From time to time a single word will open before him vistas of meaning. Such a word is "filch," as used by Iago in his conversation with Othello—"he that filches from me my good name." He will see the village gossip at work. Similarly, hundreds of words will link themselves to modern suggestions and intensify his imemediate pleasure.

As he reads various plays, and compares or contrasts them with plays by other Elizabethan dramatists, he will be particularly impressed by the absence of great passages in the latter plays and the presence of innumerable memorable passages in those of Shakspere. He will find here one of the most outstanding differences between the works of these dramatists. A Hamlet debating between life and death, a King Henry IV analyzing his inability to sleep, a

Macbeth trying to steel himself to kill a friendly king, a Portia defending an innocent man, a Marc Antony following a Brutus and inciting a mob to riot, a Lear contrasting needs and wants—these and a hundred others will reveal to him Shakspere the thinker and the word-artist. The student who likes to store away in his memory great lines that will always enrich his thinking and his living will find an inexhaustible store from which to select.

But there remains yet the greatest appeal of all—the vital interest in human beings. Here is where Shakspere is supreme. The 835 characters appearing in his 37 plays constitute the finest laboratory course for the study of human nature. If he wants to laugh or cry, hate or love, admire or detest, he will find some character to satisfy his wish. He can laugh with Falstaff, love with Desdemona, think with Hamlet, scheme with Henry IV, plot with Edmund, and talk with Polonius; in fact, there is no human emotion that Shakspere does not satisfy. Even his characters which are minor in these great plays outshine many that are major in the plays of most other dramatists, while Shakspere's major characters stand in a world by themselves. They are as well known as the actual men and women who have made the history of the world. A feeling that one knows them enriches one's life in the same way that actual friendships do.

Possibly most Shaksperian readers are not likely to pass through all these stages suggested here. In any case, the scholarly approach will not appeal to them; they will be satisfied to have a somewhat cursory knowledge of these suggested helps. However, the extent to which they know the Elizabethan Age, the plays of other dramatists, the man Shakspere, and the sources, plots, language, great passages, and characters of the plays, will determine to a great degree the genuineness of the pleasure Shakspere brings to them. They will find that Shakspere takes them out of the utilitarian, commercialized, materialistic world in which they live. For a brief time they are in the world of *As You Like It* or *The Tempest.* They learn to know better the people whom they daily see because they have briefly lived with the men and women of Shakspere. They more clearly recognize moral worth and more deeply appreciate beauty

because Shakspere has helped them more clearly to understand and evaluate life. Little by little they come to realize why "He was not of an age, but for all time."

State Teachers College
California, Pa.

COMMUNICATION

THE ANCESTRY OF AUTOLYCUS

Miss White's conscientiously detailed and elaborately documented "Biography of Autolycus" in the July *Bulletin* provokes two comments.

The first is that her account of her character's ancestry is inadequate. In her last paragraph she virtually brushes aside various attempts to associate Autolycus with stock characters of the earlier drama. I wonder if she is familiar with the character of Simplicity in Robert Wilson's plays, *The Three Ladies of London* (*c.* 1584) and *The Three Lords and the Three Ladies of London* (*c.* 1589). The correspondence in outline is so close as to justify the assumption that Shakspere carried in his mind a memory of that "Vice" of secular life. Simplicity, for example, joins in a beggar's and stealer's song which mentions catching sheets from hedges (Dodsley's *Old Plays,* 1874, VI. 347); the adjacent dialogue records other delights of the beggar's calling, such as lousing oneself under a hedge in summer, clipping and colling Madge, walking abroad to "take the wholesome air" and "tumble on the grass." Later Simplicity appears as a pedlar of ballads with comic titles (Dodsley, VI. 393). For other claimants to the honor of progeniture see also "Ancestors of Autolycus in the English Moralities and Interludes," *Washington University Studies, Humanistic Series,* IX (1922), 157-64 (cited by R. G. Noyes in his "Conventions of Song in Restoration Tragedy," *PMLA,* LIII. 1 (1938), 162).

The second remark will have occurred to everyone who has heard Professor Kittredge's exposition of *The Winter's Tale.* Miss White has fallen a victim to Autolycus's tongue and believed his fantastic story of his life, the component parts of which are self-contradictory—a petty thief's son who "served" Prince Florizel in three-pile velvet (*cf.* "Master Three-Pile, the mercer," *M for M.,* IV, iii, 11), possibly as a "gentleman-courtier," but then was whipped out of the Court (certainly not standard punishment for even as poor a gentleman as a younger son of a younger son) and now is "out of service" (strange phrase for a gentleman to use). When he "compassed" a puppet show, he did not "make" it (Miss White's word) but stole it; when he settled in rogue, he made no change in what had been his way of life from birth. Professor Kittredge quoted Professor Child's remark that if Autolycus was employed at Court at all, it was probably in blacking boots; and he pointed with telling force to his inability to wear gentlemen's clothes like a gentleman and to the absurdity of a "gentleman's" calling the Clown "sweet sir." The fun of all this is of course the transparency of Autolycus's attempt to deceive.

No; Autolycus *is* a stock figure of the older drama brought to life by the touch of Shakspere. Of course he is too witty and learned for verisimilitude, but we are used to that in Shaksperian characters, and thank God for it; we need not suppose that Autolycus, any more than his creator, learned classical allusions at the University.

WILLIAM T. HASTINGS.

EDITORIAL COMMENT

By S. A. T.

TWELFTH NIGHT (?)

We have seen *Twelfth Night* on Broadway; to be exact, on 44th Street, at the St. James Theatre. Not Shakspere's *Twelfth Night,* although the words (not all) sounded familiar, but Miss Webster's *Twelfth Night.* The two are not identical. Shakspere wrote a lovely romantic comedy; Miss Webster fed her audience with a farce comedy which very frequently degenerated into burlesque. The key words to this performance were hokum and slapstick; all that were missing were the pies of Chaplin memory and similar business. Needless to say, the spectators had a good time and declared it rapturously a "won-der-full" performance; it roared its delight when Malvolio put Olivia's veil over the top of a garden-rake and addressed the combination as if it were the lady herself, even turning her veil up to take a look at the Lady's rakish face. That's humor—of a sort. The audience also enjoyed the clever business of Sir Andrew's wrapping himself in a window drape and falling with it; and it howled its joy when the merry-makers pinned two long trailers to Malvolio's upstanding tail-end and he haughtily sauntered off without knowing what he was dragging behind him. Other such original business was greeted with guffaws of delight, *e.g.,* the conspirators hiding behind the flower-tubs and carrying them from place to place. Utterly inexcusable is the cheap angling for a laugh when Viola brings Olivia what looks like a 50c bouquet of artificial flowers from Duke Orsino. And even worse than this, if anything can be worse, is Malvolio's carrying this bouquet hidden in his coat-tail until he pulls it out and throws it at Viola after he had given the ring to her. And, no doubt, the audience enjoyed seeing Sir Toby in the last scene trundled in sitting in a gaily-colored baby cart with an umbrella over him.

The costuming was rich, colorful, and pleasing to the eye. The stage appointments were inadequate and disappointing; the staging was often absurdly incongruous, as when Viola and the Captain come out upon the rocky shore from a door leading into a substantial mansion. Orsino's home was very poorly and meagerly furnished.

In this performance Feste (Donald Burr) "ran away with the show"; he is tall, handsome, youthful, sprightly and nimble, capers well, is good at turning somersaults, and sings delightfully. Fortunately, he was given many opportunities to show his many talents. The music, which was written for him by Mr. Paul Bowles, had just the right spirit and rhythm. Fabian (Raymond Johnson), made up as a French cook, was excellent in his part, small though it is. Andrew Aguecheek (Wallace Acton) passed. Toby Belch (Mark Smith) was huge and big but he was not Sir Toby; at times he was a tenor, a few seconds later he was a bass; he did not seem to know which he was. Neither was he consistently drunk or sober. Maria (June Walker) was mischievous, lively, and always on the go—which is as it should be. Sophie Stewart, as Olivia, was terribly disappointing; she raved and ranted throughout the performance.

Helen Hayes was disappointing as Viola; she did not bring to the part the youthfulness, the pulchritude and the charm which should characterize Viola; she spoke her lines—all but the "willow cabin" speech (which she read exquisitely)—as if they were

the prosiest commonplaces, in a terribly matter-of-fact way; she strutted when she should have walked; she roared at the audience when she should have been thinking to herself; she was too obviously intent on making points and driving them home; her arms were in constant motion, like the wings of a windmill in a strong breeze; the subtleties of Viola's character eluded her, though now and then she did manifest the necessary wistfulness. The silly horseplay in her fencing scene, so utterly uncalled for, consisting of prancing and dancing and ridiculous sword-whirling, is traditional and not to be charged against Miss Hayes. Miss Webster is probably responsible for that. We shall probably be told that Miss Webster's genius 'shook the dust from Shakspere'; but there is no dust on Shakspere that needs sweeping. To us it seems that Miss Webster washed the perfume out of Shakspere, or, to change the figure, she retained the body and killed the soul.

The greatest failure, however, in this production is Mr. Maurice Evans as Malvolio. In our estimation Mr. Evans is not an actor, he is a reader; his face is incapable of subtleties of expression; he is too pretty for Malvolio and he does not understand the character. Malvolio has a permanent sourness of disposition, sufficiently indicated by his name, but Mr. Evans makes him a not unpleasant strutting peacock—and no more. Mr. Evans rarely speaks his lines as if he meant what he is saying; he is reciting pieces. Why he makes Malvolio a cockney, dropping his initial *h*'s and his final *g*'s and saying "Laidy" instead of "Lady," is beyond our comprehension; his struggling with the pronunciation of "slough" and "opposite" is irritating, not funny. Mr. Evans's best bit of acting was the scornful way in which he said the word "Run?" when Olivia commanded him to run after the peevish messenger; but it must be remembered that Shakspere never wrote that "Run" for Malvolio. In several other places, too, such liberties are taken with the text.

The ending of the performance, with the dancing and the singing of "the Rain it raineth every day" by the whole company, makes an effective and charming close and sends the audience forth in gay good humor.

THE NAMES IN *AS YOU LIKE IT*

Veteran lovers of Shakspere know that the names he assigned to many of his *dramatis personae* possess various degrees of significance and sometimes serve as keys to their characters, or to their physical appearance, or to their occupations, or to the rôle they play in the story. For some undiscoverable reason, Shakspere resorted to this technical device with unusual persistency just about the turn of the century. Several scholars have called attention to the exquisite appropriateness of some of these 'onomatopoeic names' ('bow-wow names' Hiram Corson called them) in *Hamlet, Othello,* and *King Lear,* but no one, as far as we know, has pointed out the fact that almost every name occurring in *As You Like It* is a significant name.

'Rosalind' is, of course a beautiful rose. Fletcher, quoted by Furness, rapturously comments: '*Rosalinda* is . . . a Spanish name, . . . meaning, in short, exquisitely graceful, beautiful, and sweet. The analogy will at once be seen which the image of the graceful rose bears to the exquisite spirit of Rosalind, no less than her

buoyant figure in all its blooming charms.'

'Celia' is derived from the Latin *coelum* and means 'heavenly,' a fit companion for 'Rosalinda.' Shakspere, having assigned 'Rosalinde' to his heroine, had no choice but to assign 'Celia' to her loyal and beautiful cousin.

'Phoebe,' the lovely shepherdess, takes her name from the moon, Rosalind being the sun.

'Audrey,' the country wench (so the books describe her), gets her name from the English word 'tawdry,' probably as a clue to her bad taste in clothes. Or, because of her 'honesty,' Shakspere may have associated her with St. Audry. Some say that the word means 'pretty,' 'rustic,' which, too, would be quite appropriate.

'Silvius,' from *silva* (meaning 'forest') is a fitting name for a shepherd.

'Corin,' a shepherd's name, is the masculine for 'Corinna,' a name which Herrick's charming lyric ('Corinna goes a-Maying') has made famous, and which Shakspere probably knew from his Ovid.

'Le Beau' is obviously the pretty one, a fop, an effeminate man. 'Amiens,' from Latin *amo,* is the amiable one, agreeable, not quarrelsome. 'Jaques,' the melancholy philosopher who will not return to the court, is he 'who follows' those who give him food for thought. Or, possibly, Shakspere thought him a filthy fellow and therefore gave him a name suggestive of 'jakes' (which reminds us of Ajax). 'Charles,' the wrestler, is appropriately named; the word is derived from the Teutonic *Kerl* (a churl), and means 'strong,' 'robust.' We are told that it was not a popular name in England before the reign of the Stuarts.

'Adam' was probably assigned to the good old servant because the word means 'man,' and 'man' is a good Elizabethan designation for 'servant.' Dennis may have been given his name because he is a bit tipsy (suggestive of a follower of Dionysius).

'Orlando,' as we know, is merely a variant for 'Roland,' a famous knight in medieval romances. Having a Roland, Shakspere had to provide him with an Oliver; the former being the hero, the latter had to be the villain.

'Touchstone' is obviously so named because he is the touchstone by which we test the relative merits of the country and the city, the simplicity of the rustics and the artificiality of the courtiers. 'William,' a variant of *Wilhelm,* a helmet of resolution, was probably assigned to the lukewarm and easily yielding lover on the principle of opposites.

Duke Frederick, the usurping tyrant, seems to be the only improperly named person in the play. 'Frederick,' meaning, a 'peaceful ruler,' is utterly inappropriate for him. It is possible that this name was intended for the banished Duke and that something went wrong either in the composition of the play or during a revision. Or was Shakspere a bit cynical?

Do the above facts teach us anything about Shakspere? We think they do. They show that he was not the hasty and careless writer that the books say he was; that he paid considerable attention even to the minutest details that went into his compositions. Secondly, that he was much more scholarly than has been generally thought.

...ITY OF LONDON
27 JAN 1953